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## INTRODUCTION

An increasing problem these days in facing the French Defense is the number of options at Black's disposal: there are too many of them for White's comfort.

It used to be that White had the major choices, between developing his knight at d2 or c3 on the third turn. But nowadays it is Black who has more options. He can, for example, meet 3 Nc 3 with the Winawer (3...Bb4), or with 3...Nf6 invite the Burn ( $4 \mathrm{Bg} 5, d x e 4$ ) or the Classical ( $4 B g 5, B e 7$ ) or even the MacCutcheon (4 Bg5, Bb4).

To avoid memorizing a lot of complicated and ever-shifting analysis, we propose a relatively simple alternative for White: the Advance Variation. Currently undergoing a revival, this old war-horse, analyzed first by Greco in the 1600 's, has the benefit of employing a set of positional principles not well understood by many French Defenders.

In Russia, among other centers of chess culture, the Advance Variation is sometimes known by a different name: the Nimzovich Variation. And that is only fitting. Because it was the pathfinding, Riga-born Nimzovich (18861935) who first undertook a study of the complex subject of pawn chains. In fact, the thirty page chapter of Nimzo's My System devoted to pawn chains dealt chiefly with those arising out of the Advance Variation French Defense.


Nimzovich explained that by advancing his e-pawn to the fifth rank, rather than trying to open the e-file with exd5, White has cut the board into two theaters of war. The e-pawn acts "as a demobilizing force", a "wedge",
which deprives Black of the ability to defend his kingside with ...Nf6. That kingside is a natural target for White forces, including bishops at d3 and c1, a knight at $\mathbf{f 3}$ that can hop menacingly to $\mathbf{g 5}$, and a queen that lands on $\mathbf{g 4}$ or h 5 in one move.

Black, Nimzo points out, may try to cut off one of the attacking diagonals with ...f7-f5 -- which also increases communication of his pieces along the second rank. But, as usual, any significant move in a balanced middlegame such as ...f7-f5 is bound to create new opportunities while stifling old ones.
"This otherwise excellent defensive idea," wrote Nimzovich, "would, however, fail because the pawn at $\mathbf{e} 4$ would protest violently." In most cases White will capture en passant on $\mathrm{f6}$, after which e 5 will become a backward target pawn on a half open file. Also, depending on how Black retakes on f6, he will be conceding either $\mathbf{e 5}$ or h 6 to White's invasion force.
"There was a time," Nimzovich continues, "when it was the firm conviction that a pawn chain, with the disappearance of one of its links, must give up all pretension to a happy existence." That is, once White has played exf6, or, in response to c7-c5, the alternative dxc5, he has spent part of his opening treasure. But, Nimzovich asserted, while the squares d4 and e5 may not be occupied by pawns any longer, as long as they are under control, they become valuable assets.

Yet White must be careful not to liquidate the center too quickly, else the vital square will fall under Black's control. For example, after 1 e4, e6 2 d4, d5 3 e5, c5 4 dxc5?!, Bxc5 5 Nc3? Black with 5...f6! will soon be able to advance his own pawn to $\mathbf{e 5}$ to liberate his game.

The modern Advance Variation dates from the early part of this century, specifically from the games of Nimzovich. The following he describes as "A most instructive game from A to $Z$, one which I regard as the first in which my new philosophy of the center was exhibited."

Nimzovich-Salwe, Karlsbad 1911

| $1 \mathrm{e4}$ | e6 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2 d 4 | d 5 |
| $3 \mathrm{e5}$ | $\mathrm{c5}$ |
| 4 cc 3 | Nc6 |
| 5 Nf 3 | Qb6 |

$$
6 \text { Bd3 } \quad \text { Bd7? }
$$



This natural move is actually a serious error, which Nimzovich punishes in spectacular fashion. In the post-mortems, Nimzovich's contemporaries had difficulty explaining White's convincing victory. After all, Black had played the opening exactly as the books said he should.

Eventually, the theoreticians concluded that Black had only made an error of omission. He should have played 6 ...cxd4 first. After 7 cxd4, Bd7! White's d-pawn would be threatened and there would be no convenient defense of it (8 Be3, Qxb2; $8 \mathrm{Bc} 2, \mathrm{Nb} 49 \mathrm{Bb} 3, \mathrm{Bb5}$ ).

7 dxc5! Bxc5
A modern finesse, which works in many similar positions, is 7...Qc7, threatening the e-pawn. After 8 Bf4, Bxc5 $90-0$, Nge7, however, White can play $10 \mathrm{b4}$, Bb6 11 a 4 with an excellent game.

Nimzovich's comment on Black's next move is typically emphatic:
"Black swells in triumph and throws himself hungrily on the last remaining member of the once so proud chain-family, to destroy him. His war cry is 'Room for the e-pawn!' But it happens quite otherwise."

| $80-0$ | f6 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 9 b4! | Be7 |
| 10 Bf4 | fxe5 |
| 11 Nxe5 | Nxe5 |
| 12 Bxe5 |  |
| (See following | diagram) |

White's center strategy is now clear: the pawn wedge White established with his first three moves has now been dissolved. In its place he has two excellent outpost squares, at $\mathbf{d 4}$ and $\mathbf{e 5}$, for his minor pieces.


The c3 pawn is backward and on a half-open file, a classically "weak pawn." But unless it can be attacked by a Black minor piece, it is far from weak.

Meanwhile, Black's pawns at $\mathbf{d 5}$ and $\mathbf{e 6}$ may favor him if allowed to advance. But on their current squares they are more of an obstruction.

Take note of White's next series of moves, each one designed to overprotect the d4 and e5 squares.

| $12 \ldots$ | Nf6 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 13 Nd2 | $0-0$ |
| 14 Nf3 | Bd6 |
| 15 Qe2! |  |

Releasing the occupation is risky, even for a move: 15 Bd4 allows 15...Qc7 16 Qe2, Ng4! $17 \mathrm{h3}$, e5! and Black turns the tables. As Nimzovich once put it, "The main thing is they, the enemy pawns, should be cramped."

| $15 \ldots$ | Rac8 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 16 Bd4 | Qc7 |
| 17 Ne5 | Be8 |
| 18 Rae1 | Bxe5 |
| 19 Bxe5 | Qc6 |
| 20 Bd4 | Bd7 |
| 21 Qc2 | Rf7 |
| 22 Re3 | b6 |

23 Rg3 Kh8


24 Bxh7!
Now 24...Nxh7 25 Qg6 is quite lost. The rest of the game was instructive only in the technical sense.

| 24 | e. |
| :--- | :--- |
| 25 Bg6! | Re7 |
| 26 Re1 | Qd6 |
| 27 Be3 | d4 |
| 28 Bg5 | Rxc3 |
| 29 Rxc3 | dxc3 |
| 30 Qxc3 | Kg8 |
| 31 a3 | Kf8 |
| 32 Bh4 | Be8 |
| 33 Bf5 | Qd4 |
| 34 Qxd4 | exd4 |
| 35 Rxe7 | Kxe7 |
| 36 Bd3 | Kd6 |
| 37 Bxf6 | gxf6 |
| 38 h4 | Black Resigns |

This game was widely reprinted in the years before World War I. But a remarkable thing happened: Instead of recognizing a new strategy in White's play, many annotators concluded that Black's defeat was unique to a specific position of the opening. White was only exploiting a transpositional error by Black, at move six, they said.

The possibility that White could play dxc5! followed by b2-b4 and the occupation of d4 in other variations of the Advance French was not explored until ...the 1970's.

This strategy then began to appear prominently in the games of Evgeny Sveschnikov, Siberian grandmaster. One early example from another opening entirely:

| Sveschnikov-Savon, Lvov 1978 |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 e4 | c5 |
| 2 c 3 | e6 |
| 3 d 4 | d 5 |
| $4 \mathrm{e5}$ ! |  |

One reason for the considerable experimentation with the Advance French in the past two decades is that Alapin's $\mathbf{2 c 3}$ had come into fashion against the Sicilian in the mid-1970's and White needed a satisfactory method of meeting $2 \ldots . . e 6$. Once the strength of $\mathbf{3} \mathbf{d 4}, \mathbf{d 5} \mathbf{4} \mathbf{e 5}$ was evaluated, it gave impetus to reaching the same position via the French.

| $4 \ldots$ | Nc6 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 5 Nf3 | Bd7 |
| 6 dxc5 |  |

Given a dubious designation ("?!") by Black in the Informant, this move today seems best. The move seems downright illogical, since with his first four moves White has built a pawn chain and then proceeds to disassemble it.

Further, when White captures on $\mathbf{c 5}$ and follows up with a quick b2-b4b5 he ruins his queenside pawn structure. But he gains a huge amount of developmental time, which he can well put to his advantage. Although this theme had occurred in Nimzovich's games, we'll call this the Sveschnikov Strategy.

| $6 \ldots$ | Bxc5 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 7 Bd3 | f6 |
| $8 \mathbf{~ b 4}$ | Be7 |
| $\mathbf{9} \mathbf{~ b 5 !}$ |  |

Now 9...Na5 10 Qc2!, fxe5 11 Nxe5, Nf6? allows the strong bishop check. Sveschnikov later refined White's play by advancing the b-pawn at move 7 and 8 .

| $9 \ldots$ | Nxe5 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 10 Nxe5 | fxe5 |

11 Qh5ch Kf8
12 Qxe5 Bf6
13 Qd6ch?


The queen does little good here. White should have retreated the queen to g3 where it supports Bg5. Now we see the consequences of what happens when Black is allowed to push the dreaded e-pawn.

| $13 \ldots$ | Ne 7 |
| :--- | :--- |
| $140-0$ | e5! |
| 15 Ba 3 | Kf7! |
| 16 Nd 2 | Re8 |
| 17 Rad1? | Bg4! |
| 18 Qxd8 | Raxd8 |
| 19 f3 | Be6 |
| $20 \mathrm{c4}$ | Nf5! |
| 21 cxd5 | Rxd5 |

And with control of the d-file and the use of the $\mathbf{d 4}$ outpost for the knight, Black is better. It was only through his endgame carelessness that White managed to achieve a draw. Nevertheless, this game illustrates the strengths and weaknesses of a new strategy that soon began to appear in a variety of Advance French positions.

## THE BASIC OUTLINES OF WHITE'S STRATEGY

(1) White, after 3 e5, has a spatial advantage on the kingside as well as a closed center. This invites him to attack, either with minor pieces or pawns (See in particular Illustrative Games 4-5). In most cases a spatial advantage is more important than White's bad dark-squared bishop.
(2) Because of the consequences of $\mathbf{3 e 5}$, Black must attack and his targets include d4 and the entire queenside. Generally the opening of the queenside should favor Black -- although he must also control the lines thus opened (See Illustrative Game 3 for a prematurely opened queenside).
(3) White must decide whether to maintain a solid center, with units at d4 and e5, or to exchange off one or both pawns in the Nimzovich or Sveschnikov manners.
(4) Although we tend to think that in closed positions, the element of time and superior development are devaluated, there are many occasions in the system we will outline in which superior development overcomes strategic weaknesses. See, in particular, Game 14.

We will be examining our anti-French System in this order:
Chapter One: Main Line Introduction -- 1 e4, e6 2 d4, d5 3 e5, c5 4 c3, Nc6 5 Nf3, Qb6 6 Be2

Chapter Two: Main Line II (6...cxd4/7...Nh6).
Chapter Three: The Elastic 5...Bd7
Chapter Four: The Modern 5...Nge7
Chapter Five: The Wade Finesse, 4...Qb6
Chapter Six: Maneuver with 4...Ne7
Chapter Seven: Other Defenses

## THE MAIN LINE

| 1 e 4 | e6 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2 d 4 | d 5 |
| 3 e 5 | c 5 |

With this move Black begins the traditional assault on the base of the pawn chain (d4). It is this point that is the usual Black target in the early going.

Nimzovich used military terminology to explain why Black goes after d4 and not e5: "If we wished to sap a building, we should not begin with architectural ornaments, but we should blow up its foundations, for then the destruction of the ornaments with all the rest will automatically follow."

For a survey of the alternatives at move three, see Chapter Seven.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 4 \mathrm{c3} \\
& 5 \mathrm{Nf3}
\end{aligned}
$$

Since Black's attention should be directed against the center, his queen usually ends up on b6 or c7. There is some point to 5...Qa5, inasmuch as it prepares 6...cxd4, when the White c-pawn is pinned. However, the 6 dxc5! idea is quite effective, since 6...Bxc5 allows a pawn fork at b4. See Illustrative Game 1.

$$
5 \ldots \quad \text { Qb6 }
$$

6 Be 2
A variety of other moves have come into theoretical fashion, including 6 a3, an idea dating back to Howard Staunton, which prepares to gain a valuable queenside turn with $7 \mathrm{b4}$, and $6 \mathrm{Bd3}$, which prepares to sacrifice the d4 pawn. Our move, however, offers the greatest chance of maintaining the initiative -- and at the slightest cost.


Black has some serious choices to make:
(a) $6 . . . \mathrm{Nge} 7$
(b) $6 . . . \mathrm{Bd} 7$
(c) $6 . . . \mathrm{f} 6$
(d) $\mathbf{6 . . . N h 6}$

For Black's best move, 6...cxd4!, see Chapter Two. This move deserved a chapter of its own. In some of these lines we will be able to use the Sveschnikov Strategy, in others we will have to try something else.
(a)
6 ...
Nge7
(After 1 e4, e6 2 d4, d5 3 e5, c5 4 c3, Nc6 5 Nf3, Qb6 6 Be2)
Black prepares to attack d4 (70-0?, cxd4 $8 c x d 4, N f 5$ and the d-pawn dies under the worst circumstances). But 6...Nge7 is inexact because it allows us to use the Sveschnikov Strategy under optimum conditions.

$$
7 \text { dxc5! } \quad \text { Qc7 }
$$

What makes this a particularly good version of the dxc5 strategy is that Black cannot immediately recapture on $\mathbf{c 5}$ with his f8-bishop. If he retakes with his queen, White gains too much time: 7...Qxc5 8 b4!, Qb6 9 b5! and Ba3.

## 8 Nd4!



The threat is a devastating 9 Nb5! Black is lost immediately after 8...Nxe5 9 Nb5, Qxc5 10 Qd4!, an old trap.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 8 \ldots . \\
& 90-0
\end{aligned} \quad \text { Qxe5 }
$$

Now if Black just had the benefit of three or four free moves (...Qc7, ...Ng6, ...e6-e5) he would have a fine game. But in a semi-open position, the absence of those moves is bound to cost. Now $9 . . . N g 610 \mathrm{b4}, \mathrm{Be} 711 \mathrm{f} 4$ and 12 f5 or 9 ...Nf5 10 Nxf5, Qxf5 11 b4 offer White excellent prospects.
(b)
$6 \ldots$... Bd7
(After 1 e4, e6 2 d4, d5 3 e5, c5 4 c3, Nc6 5 Nf3, Qb6 6 Be2)
This move enables Black to mobilize his queenside pieces quickly, with ...Rc8 or even ...0-0-0. At the same time it delays an attack on $\mathbf{d 4}$-- and thereby invites the dxc5 idea.
$70-0$


$$
7 \ldots \quad 0-0-0
$$

On 7...Rc8 White would have everything in place for $\mathbf{8}$ dxc5!, Bxc5?! ( $8 . . Q c 7$ ! $9 B f 4, B x c 510 b 4$ is slightly better) $9 \mathrm{b4}$ with a fine version of the Sveschnikov plan: 9...Bf8 10 Na3, Qc7 11 Nb5, Qb8 12 Bf4 and now 12...Nf6?! 13 Nfd4, Nxe5 14 Nxa7! led to a winning game in AntoshinBannik, USSR 1955.

Also good is 10 Bd 3 , Nge7 $11 \mathrm{Bf} 4, \mathrm{Bg} 612 \mathrm{Bg} 3, \mathrm{Be} 713 \mathrm{~h} 4!$ as in Castro-Korchnoi, Linares 1979.

Black could avoid much of this White piece activity by playing 7...cxd4 8 cxd4 first. Then 8...Rc8 looks dangerous, but 9 Nc3! plugs up the c-file just in time. In theory, Black has the edge on the queenside because of the preponderance of his pieces in that sector. But White, with Na4-c5 and a2a3 followed by b2-b4-b5, has equally promising chances on the queenside.

Note also, that on 7...cxd4 8 cxd4, Nge7 9 Nc3, Nf5 we have a position reminiscent of our main line -- see subsection (e). However, the insertion of 6...Bd7 has cost Black a useful tempo and White can beat off the attack on d4 with 10 Na4!, Qa5 11 Bd2, Bb4 12 Bxb4, Nxb4 13 Nc5 or 10...Qc8 11 Bf4 and 12 Rc1.

8 Na 3
White can also try 8 dxc5, Bxc5 9 b4. For example, 9...Be7 10 Na3 threatens 11 Be 3, Qc7 $12 \mathrm{Nb5}$.

8 ... cxd4
9 cxd4 Kb8
Black anticipates an attack along the c-file.
10 Nc2 Rc8
11 Rb1!
And White gets to push the b-pawn without dissolving his center. Now 11...Nh6 12 b4! (Zlotnik-Damsky, Dubna 1968) is a sham sacrifice because of 13 a3. With 13 b5 coming and no Black counterplay impending, White has the middlegame well in hand.
(c) 6 ... f6
(After 1 e4, e6 2 d4, d5 3 e5, c5 4 c3, Nc6 5 Nf3, Qb6 6 Be2)
This indicates a mixed signal from Black: he is attacking d4 with his fifth move and then shifts to e5 with his sixth. As we'll see in Chapter Three, it makes more sense for Black to play 5...Bd7 if he has this in mind, so that after 6 Be2, 66 he can later play ...Qc7.

## 7 0-0

Yes, 7 exf6 may grant White a nice outpost square at e5 but it gives Black too easy a development (7...Nxf6, 8...Bd6, 9...0-0). White should make Black work for his king safety.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 7 \ldots \\
& 8 \text { Nxe5! fxe5 }
\end{aligned}
$$

Forcing ( 9 Bh 5 ch ) a favorable exchange of knights. Now the b1-knight can join the action.

| 8 ... | Nxe5 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 9 dxe5 | Bd7 |
| (See following diagram) |  |
| 10 c 4 ! |  |

This idea has been attributed to Igor Zaitsev, longtime second to Anatoly Karpov, who first played it in 1977 in a similar position. With the queen
somewhat misplaced on b6 Black is unable after 10 c4 to properly defend the attacked d-pawn.


Previously White would reinforce e5 with moves such as $10 \mathrm{Nd} 2, \mathrm{Ne} 711$ Nf3, Nc6. Then Medyanikova-Chiburdanidze, Frunze 1975 went 12 Qc2, Be7 13 Bf4, 0-0-0 14 b4! with good attacking chances.

After 10 c4 Black must make some concession in the center. Clearly 10...dxc4?! will leave his e6 pawn as a cripple. But after 10...d4 11 Nd2 and Ne4/Bf3 White has excellent prospects. Similarly $10 . . . N e 711$ Nc3, Bc6 12 Bg4 is good for White.

## (d) <br> 6 ... <br> Nh6

(After 1 e4, e6 2 d4, d5 3 e5, c5 4 c3, Nc6 5 Nf3, Qb6 6 Be2)
This odd-looking move has been the subject of considerable analysis because of the sacrificial possibility 7 Bxh6!, Qxb2?! 8 Be3!, Qxa1 9 Qc2. However, Black does better with the simple recapture, 7...gxh6 followed by ...Bg7 and ...0-0.

## 7 Bd3!



A surprising choice: White loses a tempo with the bishop in order to meet 7...cxd4 8 cxd4, Nf5 with 9 Bxf5. However, the loss of time is not serious because of the semi-closed nature of the position and Black's inability to exploit any open lines immediately.

The move 7 Bd3 has so far eluded serious attention but has appeared in several games in the last few years by young American players, including GM Alex Fishbein, whose father, Gregory, appears to hold the patent on 7 Bd3.
$7 \ldots$
8 cxd4

Of course, 8...Nxd4?? loses a piece since 9 Nxd4, Qxd4?? 10 Bb5ch wins the queen.

$$
8 \text {... Nf5 }
$$

Another key point in this Fishbein Variation is revealed in 8...Bd7 (threatening 9...Nxd4) 9 Bc2!, Nb4 10 Bxh6, gxh6 $110-0$ after which White, turning over both of his bishops for knights, will obtain a solid center and attacking chances on both wings. See Illustrative Game 2.

Similarly 8...Nb4 9 Bxh6, gxh6 10 0-0. This is better than 9 0-0, Nxd3 10 Qxd3, Bd7 11 Nc3, Nf5 which allows Black's h6 knight a normal life -although White still stands a bit better after $12 \mathbf{g 4}, \mathrm{Ne} 7$ as in EdelmanHandley, Lloyds 1988.

## 9 Bxf5

The entire point of White's play. Note that on 8...Bd7 9 Bc2, Nf5 10 Bxf5 Black would have gained a tempo (...Bd7) on our main line. But since Black is virtually committed to defending his $\mathbf{d 5}$ and $\mathbf{f 7}$ points by way of ...Be6, this tempo will be lost back and we will transposes exactly back into the main line.

| $9 \ldots$ | exf5 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 10 0-0 | Be6 |
| $11 ~ \mathrm{Nc} 3$ |  |
| (See following diagram) |  |

An important benefit of White's play is that his b1-knight can be developed here, rather than at d2, and therefore can go in some cases to a4 and in others to $\mathbf{f 4}$, via e2.

11 ... h6


To prevent 12 Ng 5 as well as to threaten ...g7-g5 in connection with queenside castling. If Black insists on kingside castling, White will use the g5 square for minor pieces ( $11 \ldots \mathrm{Be} 712 \mathrm{Na4}, \mathrm{Qc7} 13 \mathrm{Bg} 5$ ).

12 h4
A typical restrictive move to hold up Black on the kingside and prepare Ne2-f4. If now $12 . . . B e 713$ Ne2!, 0-0-0 White should not encourage 13 Nf4, g5! but rather begin queenside operations with $14 \mathrm{Rb1}$ and 15 b4, even as a pawn sacrifice.

One recent game, Benjamin-Edelman, New York 1992, went 14 Rb1, g5?! 15 hxg5, hxg5 16 Bxg5!, Bxg5 17 Nxg5 and Black's attack was insufficient after 17...Kb8 18 Kf2!, Bd7 19 Qb3, Qa6 20 Ng3 and 21 Rh1.

For the best sixth move for Black, 6...cxd4!, see the next chapter.

## ILLUSTRATIVE GAMES

(1) Gonsioer-Kubien, Wroclaw 1975

| 1 e 4 | e6 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2 d 4 | d5 |
| 3 e5 | c5 |
| $4 \mathrm{c3}$ | Nc6 |
| 5 Nf3 | Qa5?! |
| 6 dxc5! | Qc7 |

Better than $6 . . . Q x c 57 \mathrm{b4}$, Qb6 8 Bd3. Now the threat of 7...Nxe5 allows Black to retake on $\mathbf{c 5}$ with the bishop.

| 7 Bb5 | Bxc5 |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\mathbf{8 0 0}$ | Bd7?! |
| 9 Qe2 | Nge7 |


| $10 \mathrm{b4!}$ | Bb6 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 11 Bd 3 | Ng 6 |
| $12 \mathrm{Re1}$ | $\mathbf{0 - 0}$ |
| 13 Na 3 |  |


"But isn't the c3-pawn hopelessly weak now?," the theoretical authorities said of such positions before 1975. Yes, the b2-b4 thrust has done severe damage to White's queenside pawn structure. But it has also gained valuable space, which now allows White to play on both wings. White can, in fact, offer the c-pawn as a gambit.

| $13 \ldots$ | a6 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 14 Nc 2 | Na 7 |
| $15 \mathrm{a} 4!$ | Qxc3 |
| 16 Ra 3 | Qc8 |
| 17 h 4 |  |

Black is a pawn ahead but his pieces are on poor squares. His plan of ...Bb5 was stopped by White's 15 th move and he now faces the danger of 18 $\mathrm{h5}$ and 19 h 6 (or 18 Ng 5 and $19 \mathrm{Qh5}$ ) on the other wing.

| $17 \ldots$ | f5 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 18 exf6 | gxf6? |
| 19 Qd2! |  |

Heading for h6. For better or worse, Black had to retake with his rook on f6 last move. The rest of the game consists of the inevitable sacrifice.

| $19 \ldots$ | Qe8 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 20 h5 | Ne7 |
| 21 Bxh7ch! | Kxh7 |
| 22 Qh6ch | Kg8 |
| 23 Nh4! | Qb8 |

## CHAPTER ONE: The Main Line

Hoping to give up the queen (24 Rg3ch, Qxg3) and last to move 35.

| 24 Bf4! | e5 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 25 Ng6! | Nf5 |
| 26 Qh8ch | Kf7 |
| 27 Qh7ch | Ke6 |
| 28 g4 | Black Resigns |

(2) Fishbein-Ostenstad, Stavanger 1991

| 1 e 4 | $\mathrm{e6}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2 d 4 | $\mathrm{d5}$ |
| $3 \mathrm{e5}$ | $\mathrm{c5}$ |
| 4 c 3 | Nc |
| $5 \mathrm{Nf3}$ | Qb6 |
| 6 Be 2 | Nh 6 |

This move was still played a lot because until fairly recently it was endorsed by almost all "book".

| 7 Bd 3 | cxd4 |
| :--- | :--- |
| $8 \mathrm{cxd4}$ | Bd7 |
| 9 Bc2 | Nb4 |
| 10 Bxh6 | gxh6 |
| $11 \mathbf{0 - 0}$ | $0-0-0$ |
| 12 Nc 3 | Nxc2 |
| 13 Rc1! |  |



A neat gain of time. White wants his rook on the c-file (13...N-moves 14 $N x d 5 c h$ ) and his knights on the kingside.

| $13 \ldots$ | Kb8 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 14 Rxc2 | Rg8 |


| 15 Qd2 | Bc6 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 16 Ne2 | Qa6 |
| 17 a3 | Bb5 |
| 18 Re1 | Be7 |
| 19 Ng3 | Rg6 |
| 20 Rec1 | Bc6 |
| 21 Qf4 | Rf8 |
| 22 Nh5 |  |

It's remarkable how little scope the bishops have compared with the knights. White will now strengthen his position, if allowed, with Nf6 and g2-g3. But a blunder shortens the game.

22 ...
23 Nf6
24 Rc3
25 Rxc6!
26 Nd7ch
27 Nxf8
28 Nxe6ch
29 b4

Qd3
a6?
Qe2
bxc6
Kc7
Rg7
fxe6


With numerous remaining weaknesses, at a6, c6, e6, and h7, Black might consider himself fortunate to trade down to a lost endgame.

| $29 \ldots$ | Qd3 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 30 Qxh6! | Rg6 |
| 31 Qe3 | Qxe3 |
| 32 fxe3 | Rg8 |
| 33 Nd2 | a5 |
| 34 bxa5 | Bxa3 |
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| 35 Rf1 | Rg7 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 36 Nb3 | Kb7 |
| 37 Ra1 | Bb4 |
| 38 a6ch | Ka7 |
| 39 Ra4 | Bf8 |
| 40 Na5 | Rc7 |
| 41 Nb7 |  |

Now there is nothing else to stop the triumphant advance of the White king.

| 41 ... | Rc8 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 42 Kf2 | Be7 |
| 43 Ke2 | Rg8 |
| $\mathbf{4 4} \mathbf{~ g 3}$ | h5 |
| 45 Ra1 | h4 |
| 46 gxh4 | Rg2ch |
| 47 Kf3 | Rxh2 |
| 48 Na5 | Rc2 |
| 49 h5 | Bf8 |
| 50 Nb7 | Rc3 |
| 51 Nd6 | Black Resigns |

## CHAPTER TWO: Main Line (6...cxd4/7...Nh6)

We now turn to the critical theory-endorsed answer to the Advance Variation.

| 1 e 4 | e6 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2 d 4 | d5 |
| 3 e 5 | $\mathrm{c5}$ |
| 4 c 3 | Nc |

For no apparent reason you will sometimes see 4...a6?! played here but it doesn't really fit into any plan of development. White should simply continue 5 Nf3, Nc6 6 Bd3, since 6...Qb6 7 0-0, cxd4 8 cxd4, Bd7 allows White to defend his d-pawn with 9 Bc2.

And 6...f5 7 exf6, Nxf6 $80-0$ followed by Re1 must favor White slightly (8...Bd6 9 Rel, cxd4 10 cxd4, Qc7 11 Nc3, Bielczyk-Joksic, Zabrze 1977). 5 Nf3 Qb6

## 6 Be 2



6 ... cxd4!
This exchange is now regarded as most exact because it eliminates all dangers resulting from dxc5 and in some key lines provides Black with a crucial ...Bb4ch.

7 cxd4
Black should now launch his attack on the only real White target -- the d4-pawn -- and quickly. Otherwise, the edge in space conferred by the e5pawn gives White too much play, e.g. 7...Bd7 8 Nc3, Nh6 9 a3, Nf5 10 Na4!, Qd8 11 h4, Be7 12 h5!, Rc8 13 g4! (Heubner-Duckstein, Claire Benedict 1972).

Historically, the insufficiency of quiet play by Black was shown by RetiSpielmann, Vienna 1928 (Illustrative Game 3). Black opened the c-file for his pieces -- and ended up losing because of White's control of that line.


7 ... Nh6
Now regarded as best. The prime alternative is $7 .$. Nge7, which has the same 8...Nf5 objective but some drawbacks.

If White then continues 8 Nc 3 it won't matter which seventh move Black chooses. However, there is a subtle but significant difference between the two knight moves. After 7...Nge7 White can try 8 Na ! with the idea of 8...Nf5 9 Nc2 (In contrast, 7...Nh6 8 Na3, Bxa3! and $9 . . . N f 5$ favors Black). After 7...Nge7 $8 \mathbf{N a 3}$, Nf5 $9 \mathbf{N c} 2$ the key b4 square is covered.


Then (1) 9...Nb4 10 Nxb4, Bxb4ch 11 Bd2, Bxd2ch only leads to a better endgame for White.

Or (2) 9...Bb4ch forces $10 \mathrm{Kf1}$ but that is a good move here. White then threatens $11 \mathrm{g4}$ (11...Nge7 12 a traps the bishop) and ensures that he will
be able to push the other knight-pawn effectively. After $10 . . . B e 711$ b4! the pawn cannot be taken because of $\mathbf{1 2} \mathbf{~ R b 1}$ and this ensures White a slight edge after 11...Bd7 12 a3 followed by h2-h4-h5 (or, after ...h7-h5, by Bg5).

Or (3) More enterprising is $9 . . . \mathrm{Nb} 410 \mathrm{Ne} 3$ !? and then 10...Nxe3 11 Bxe3, Nc6! 12 0-0, sacrificing the b-pawn (12..Qxb2 13 a4 followed by $R b l$ ). If Black does not go pawn-grabbing, White's spatial edge remains prohibitively large. For example, 11...Be7 (instead of $11 \ldots . . N c$ 万) $\mathbf{1 2} \mathbf{0 - 0 , 0 - 0}$ 13 a3, Nc6 14 b4, Bd7 15 Bd3, a6 16 Rc1, Na7? 17 Ng5!, Bxg5 18 Bxg5, Bb5 19 Rc3!, Nc6 20 Bxh7ch! and in Soltis-Polyakin, New York 1993, Black resigned in view of $\mathbf{2 0} \ldots$..Kxh7 21 Rh3ch, Kg8 22 Bf6! and mates. Not much better was 19 ...Bxd3 20 Rxd3 followed by Bf6! and Rg3. 8 Nc 3
It is not essential for White to beat off the impending attack on $\mathbf{d 4}$ in time. Occasionally $\mathbf{8} \mathbf{b 3}$, Nf5 $9 \mathbf{~ B b 2}$ has been tried but ...f6 always seems to come too quickly, e.g. 9...Be7 10 0-0, Bd7 11 g4, Nh4 12 Nxh4, Bxh4 13 Na3, 0-0 $14 \mathbf{f 4} \mathbf{f 6}$ as in a brutal 1992 loss by Viktor Kupreychik, one of the world's experts on the Advance Variation.

And naturally not 8 Bxh6, Qxb2!

| $8 . .$. | Nf5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 9 Na4 |  |

This first gained attention in the game Steinitz-Maroczy, Vienna 1898 which continued 9...Qa5ch 10 Kf1?! after which 10...b5! helps Black too much.

$$
9 \text {... Qa5ch }
$$

As indicated by Illustrative Game 3, Black must try to inflict some damage on White's development or the enemy's superior center will assert itself. Here $9 . .$. Qd8 $100-0$, Bd7 11 a3, a5 12 Bf4 leaves White with the usual space advantage.

Note that 9...Bb4ch 10 Bd2, Qa5 leads back into the main line by way of transposition.

## 10 Bd2! Bb4 <br> 11 Bc 3

A key position arises. When this occurred in the 1934 NimzovichStahlberg match Black simplified with 11...Bxc3ch 12 Nxc3, Qb6 (not 12...Qb4 $13 a 3$ !, Qxb2? 14 Na4!) and he appeared to stand well because of the renewed attack on $\mathbf{d 4}$.

However, Nimzovich's 13 Bb5! turned out to be more than the act of a desperate player. Play continued 13...0-0 14 Bxc6, Qxb2 15 Na4, Qb4ch 16 Qd2!, Qxd2ch 17 Kxd2. And although the players agreed to a draw immediately after 17...bxc6 18 Nc 5 , White stands better despite his pawn minus (check it out on your own).

Better after 13 Bb5 is 13...Bd7 14 Bxc6, Bxc6 15 Qd2 with play akin to our main line but with an extra pair of pawns on the board. For example, 15...0-0 16 0-0, a5 17 Rfe1, Rfc8 18 g4!, Ne7 19 Nh4, Bd7 20 f4 with a burgeoning kingside expansion (Hennings-Knaak, Leipzig 1981). Mohring suggests $15 . .$. Bb5 16 Nxb5, Qxb5 is the way to equality but perhaps 16 0-0$0!?$ is better.

Also note that White gets to keep his good bishop -- but remove his bad one -- if Black plays the quiet 11...Bd7?! 12 a3! or 11...a6 120 0-0, b5 13 Nc5! with advantage, because of 13...Bxc3 14 Nb3!, Qb4 15 bxc3, Qxc3?? 16 Rc1.

$$
11 \ldots \quad \text { b5! }
$$

This forcing move pushes White into some exchanges he might otherwise want to avoid.

| 12 a3! | Bxc3ch |
| :--- | :--- |
| 13 Nxc3 | b4 |

Clearly, Black does not want to leave his remaining bishop hemmed in by this pawn (13...a6? $14 \mathrm{b4}$ !).


14 axb4
This has been an automatic capture but one wonders why $14 \mathrm{Nb5}$ !? hasn't been tried. On 14...bxa3ch 15 Kf1 White has a nice 16 Rxa3 or 16 g4 coming up.

## 15 Bb5

White should be reluctant to give up this piece but he must seek a different kind of middlegame. Instead of a slashing minor-piece attack directed at $h 7$, he accepts a double-edged situation in which both sides have queenside weaknesses. But White still has prospects on the kingside because of his ability to expand there with h2-h4-h5 and g2-g4.

| 15 ... | Bd7 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 16 Bxc6 | Bxc6 |  |
| 17 | Qd2 |  |



At the end of a long and relatively forced series of moves we have reached a stem position. The book authorities universally declare this position even or better for Black. But is it?
(a) 17...0-0 allows White to follow suit -- $\mathbf{1 8} \mathbf{0 - 0}$, Rfb8 and now Purdy claims an edge for Black after 19 Rab1, a5 although 20 g4, Ne7 21 Ng 5 is not a trivial attacking idea ( $22 Q f 4$ or $22 f 4$ ).

Watson regards 19...Qe7 as better so that Black can meet $20 \mathrm{g4}$ with 20...Nh4 (21 Ne1, Rb3 22 f4, Rab8 23 Qf2, Bb5). But once Black starts retreating on the queenside, White can demonstrate that he has chances there also -- 19...Qe7 20 b4, Rb6 (20...Rxb4?? 21 Nxd5!) 21 b5, Be8 22 Qa2 or 20 ...Bb5 21 Rfc1, Bc4 22 Na 4 and 23 Nc5.

Illustrative Game 4 (at the end of the chapter) will see White defend the b-pawn with his other rook ( 19 Rfbl ) after which 19...Bb5 allowed him to begin kingside operations -- 20 g4!, Ne7 21 Ng5, h6 22 Nf3 and 23 h 4 .
(b) The immediate 17...Bb5, stopping White from castling, has been tried recently, with 18 Nxb5, Qxb5 19 Ra5 to follow.

Then 19...Qb6 20 0-0 led to a good position for White in Illustrative Game 5 because of the same expansion -- 20...0-0 21 Rc1, Rab8 22 Rc2, h6 23 Rac5, Rb7 and now 24 g4!, Ne7 25 h4.

What about the persistent 19...Qc4? Then 20 Rc5, Qa6 21 Ra5 gets nowhere but 20 Qc3!? might favor White, particularly after 20...Qxc3ch?.

## ILLUSTRATIVE GAMES

(3) Reti-Spielmann, Vienna 1928

There had been previous Advance French games which showed that the e5-pawn was a stronger asset than the d4-pawn was a weakness. But this game illuminated that message in an influential manner. It also showed how White was not limited to kingside attacks in the Advance Variation.

| 1 e 4 | e6 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 d 4 | d5 |
| 3 e5 | c5 |
| 4 c 3 | Nc6 |
| 5 Nf 3 | Qb6 |
| 6 Be 2 | cxd4 |
| 7 cxd 4 | Bd7?! |
| $80-0$ | Nge7 |
| 9 Nc 3 | Nf5 |
| 10 Na 4 ! |  |

Just in time to beat off the attack on the d-pawn. Had Black not dillydallied at move seven he would be able to deliver an effective check now.

On 10...Qd8 White would likely kick the queen with $11 \mathrm{Bg5}$, since 11...Be7 12 Bxe7, Qxe7 13 Rc1 and 14 Nc5 solves all of White's problems and leaves him with a comfortable positional advantage. In fact, that is just about what happens in the game.

| $10 \ldots$ | Qa5 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 11 Bd2 | Bb4 |
| 12 Bxb4 | Qxb4 |
| 13 a3 | Qe7 |

(See following diagram)

White's superiority is manifest -- better bishop, lead in development, control of the queenside (which is supposedly "Black's wing"). Now with a few careful moves -- such as avoiding 14 Nc5?, Ncxd4 15 Nxd4, Qxc5 -- he can begin a somewhat unusual queenside attack.


| 14 Rc1 | 0-0 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 15 Nc5 | b6 |
| 16 Nxd7 | Qxd7 |
| 17 Bb5! | Nfe7 |
| 18 Qd3 |  |

This last move gains a crucial tempo for the doubling of rooks on the cfile and also stops the breaking of the bishop pin with 18...a6. Now Black must take time out to deal with 19 Ng 5 !

| $18 \ldots$ | h6 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 19 Rc3! | a5 |

Or 19...Rfc8 20 Rfc1, Qb7?! 21 Ba6.
20 Rfc1
21 Qc2!
Rfc8
Black Resigns
The final position resembles another Nimzovich game, but one he would have preferred to forget -- Nimzo's celebrated loss to Alexander Alekhine in a Winawer French at San Remo 1930.
(4) Epstein-Saunina, Tiblisi 1976

| $1 \mathrm{e4}$ | e6 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2 d 4 | d 5 |
| $3 \mathrm{e5}$ | $\mathrm{c5}$ |
| 4 c 3 | $\mathrm{Nc6}$ |
| 5 Nf 3 | Qb6 |

## 6 Be 2

The position with 6 Bd3 is quite old. After 6...Bd7?! 7 dxc5, Bxc5 we have Lowe-Kennedy, match 1849 (!), which Howard Staunton, then the world's best player, considered favorable for Black -- so much so that he sometimes gave White's third move a question mark.

| $6 \ldots$ | cxd4 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 7 cxd4 | Nh6 |
| 8 Nc3 | Nf5 |
| 9 Na4 | Bb4ch |

The position after White's 17th move has occurred so often in master games in the past that one can imagine the two players taking less than ten minutes to reach it.

| 10 Bd2 | Qa5 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 11 Bc3 | b5 |
| 12 a3 | Bxc3ch |
| 13 Nxc3 | b4 |
| 14 axb4 | Qxb4 |
| 15 Bb5 | Bd7 |
| 16 Bxc6 | Bxc6 |
| 17 Qd2 | $0-0$ |
| 18 0-0 | Rfb8 |
| 19 Rfb1 | Bb5 |



With this maneuver, Black is trying to bring his "bad" bishop into an effective middlegame role, either at $\mathbf{c 4}$ where it stops Ra2, or on b3. The chief drawback is that this leaves Black seriously undermanned on the other wing.

| $20 \mathrm{g4} 4$ | Ne 7 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 21 Ng 5 | h 6 |

This gives White a way of forcing open kingside lines. Black probably did not relish the idea of 21...Be8, to anticipate 22 Qf4, or 21...Ng6, to await 22 Qc2.

| $22 \mathrm{Nf3}$ | Nc6 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 23 h 4 ! | a5 |
| 24 h 5 | a4 |



Black appears to be a move or two away from breaking through -- with 25...Bc4 and 26...a3. And White can't push the g-pawn without losing the d-pawn. Or can he?

| 25 g5! | hxg5 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 26 Qxg5 | Nxd4 |
| 27 Nxd4 | Qxd4 |
| 28 h6 | g6 |
| 29 Rd1 | Qc5 |
| 30 h7ch! |  |

This clears the h-file for heavy pieces.

| 30... | Kxh7 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 31 Kg2 | Kg8 |
| 32 Rh1 | Qf8 |
| 33 Rh6 | d4 |
| 34 Rah1 | Qg7 |
| 35 Qf6! |  |

Nice. Trading queens will set up an unstoppable Rh8 mate.

| $35 \ldots$ | Bc6ch |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\mathbf{3 6} \mathbf{f 3}$ | Bxf3ch |
| $\mathbf{3 7} \mathbf{K x f} 3$ | Black forfeits |

(5) Nunn-Schmittdiel, Dortmund 1991
(First 16 moves the same as the previous game)

17 Qd2 $\quad$ Bb5
18 Nxb5

The endgame after 18 Na4, Qxd2ch 19 Kxd2 is another idea.

| $18 \ldots$ | Qxb5 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 19 Ra5 | Qb6?! |
| $200-0$ | $0-0$ |
| 21 Rc1! |  |

If White piles up on the a7 pawn (21 Rfal) the best he can realistically hope for is an exchange of queenside pawns and a trade of queens that will likely leave Black -- with d 4 as a target - with the better chances.

The text leaves matters in the middlegame. Black probably does best to trade off both pairs of rooks, rather than leave the c-file in White's hands.

| $21 \ldots$ | Rab8 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 22 Rc2 | h6? |
| 23 Rac5 | Rb7 |
| 24 g4! | Ne7 |
| 25 h4 |  |

White does not need the Ng5 adventure of the previous game, but the absence of another minor piece limits his attacking chances. He has a similar method of penetrating the kingside, by pushing both these pawns to the fifth rank. Note that $\mathbf{2 5}$...f6 26 exf6, Rxf6 (26...gxh6? 27 Qxh6) 27 Ne5 increases White's piece superiority.

Rfb8
26 h 5
Qd8

| 27 Qc1! | Qf8 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 28 g5 | Kh7 |
| 29 Qf4 |  |



White's winning plans include 30 Rc7 followed by 31 gxh6 or 31 g6ch.

29 ...
30 Rc 7
31 Qc1
32 Rc8
33 Rxc8
34 Qc6!

Nf5
Qd8
Rb3?
Rxc8
Qa5

There is no longer a defense to Qe8-g8 mate or $\mathbf{3 5} \mathbf{g} \mathbf{g c h}$.

| $34 \ldots$ | Qa1ch |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\mathbf{3 5}$ Kg2 | Nh4ch |
| 36 Nxh4 | Black Resigns |

## CHAPTER THREE: The Elastic 5...Bd7

While 5...Qb6 was once a semi-automatic response by Black, it began to fall out of fashion in the 1970's. In place of the queen move, Black has been employing a variety of development systems, involving ...Bd7 and the deployment of his knights. Currently the most popular is 5...Bd7.

| 1 e 4 | e6 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2 d 4 | d 5 |
| 3 e 5 | $\mathrm{c5}$ |
| $4 \mathrm{c3}$ | Nc 6 |
| 5 Nf 3 | $\ldots$ |

White is preparing to capture on $\mathbf{c 5}$ after which he gains time and useful queenside terrain by b2-b4-b5. Of course, Black can prevent that with 5...cxd4 here, but after 6 cxd4 White has cleared c3 for the development of his knight.

$$
5 \ldots \quad \text { Bd7 }
$$

Gaining kingside space with 5...f5 eliminates too many of Black's resources (such as ...Ng8-e7-f5 or ...f7-f6). See Illustrative Game 7.

On the other hand, Maroczy's $5 . . \mathrm{ff}$ seems to attack the front of the pawn chain too early. Since White has not committed his f1-bishop he can respond 6 Bb5! e.g. 6...Bd7 7 0-0, Nxe5? 8 Nxe5, Bxb5 9 Qh5ch.


The move 5...Bd7 was analyzed by Greco circa 1620 and he concluded Black was doing fine after $6 \mathrm{Be} 3, \mathrm{c} 47 \mathrm{b3}, \mathrm{b5}$. The diagrammed position was then forgotten for roughly three and a half centuries.

Then, in 1977, this flexible bishop move received instant legitimacy when

Viktor Korchnoi used it in the final candidates match of that year against Boris Spassky. It's chief value is its elasticity: ...Bd7 is virtually indispensable in the Advance French, so by inserting it at this point Black retains the options of ...Qb6 as well as ...Qc7 -- or as Korchnoi used it, of delaying any queen development at all until after the 15 th move.

For example, 6 Bd 3 would be an error because of $6 . . . c x d 47$ cxd4, Qb6 and the d-pawn is under fire. And 6 Na 3 invites $6 . . . \mathrm{cxd} 4$ and 7...Bxa3.

## 6 dxc5!

We associate this idea in general with Evgeny Sveschnikov -- and in particular in this position. The grandmaster from Chelyabinsk has won several fine games with it, although a number of others preceded him in playing 6 dxc5, including Max Euwe and P.H. Clarke.

Of course, White could continue instead with the orthodox 6 Be 2 , which nowadays is likely to lead to 6...f6!? 7 0-0, fxe5 8 Nxe5, Nxe5 9 dxe5 and a quick c3-c4. But the text is part of a system that is easiest to learn and consistent with our recommendations in similar positions.

$$
6 \text {... Bxc5 }
$$

Black gains little from inserting 6...Qc7 7 Bf4 before capturing on $\mathbf{c 5}$.


## 7 b4

Despite his 6 dxc5 predecessors, it was Sveschnikov who adopted this natural follow-up to White's sixth move. There is nothing really wrong with 7 Bd 3 and then $8 \mathrm{b4}$, since it is unlikely that Black is going to spend a tempo on the preventative 7...a5.

After 7 Bd 3 , Nge 78 b4! prevents the bishop from retreating along the c5-f8 diagonal. Then 8 ...Bb6 9 b5, Na5 10 0-0, Rc8 11 a4, Ng6 transposes into our main line below. Now 12 Ba3, Bc5! should be adequate for Black (Sveschnikov-Balashov, Lvov 1978) but a more attractive method of development is $12 \operatorname{Re} 1$ and on 12 ...f6 then 13 Ra 2 ! and the rook swings into action at e2. See Illustrative Game 6.

However, if White is going to play dxc5 he should follow it up with b2b4. The hazards of 7 Bd 3 , Nge 78 Bf 4 , $\mathbf{N g} 69 \mathrm{Bg} 3$, f6! are shown in Illustrative Game 8.

$$
7 \ldots \quad \text { Bb6 }
$$

The bishop seems to get in the way on e7. But 7...Be7 worked out well in Sveschnikov-Ulibin, Chelyabinsk 1989 in which Black delayed kingside castling until the 24th move. Instead he concentrated on the queenside: 8 b5, Na5 9 Bd3, Qc7 10 Bf4?, Nc4 11 0-0, (Or 11 a4, Nb2!) Bxb5 12 Nd4, Nd7 $13 \mathbf{Q g 4}, \mathbf{g 5 !}$ ?

More accurate for White is $\mathbf{1 0 a 4}$ so that 10 ...Nc4 $\mathbf{1 1} \mathbf{0 - 0}$ leaves White well placed.

| $8 \mathrm{b5}$ | $\mathrm{Na5}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 9 Bd 3 | Qc7 |
| $100-0$ |  |

White can delay this with 10 Qe2, so as to meet $10 . .$. Ne 7 with h2-h4-h5, e.g. 10...Ne7 11 h4, h6 12 0-0, Rc8 13 Bf4, Nc4 14 a4, f5 15 h5, 0-0 and now once again the Sveschnikov rook-lift 16 Ra2!? (Kharlov-Kramnik, Chelyabinsk 1991, which led to a spirited draw after 16...Be8 17 Nh4, d4 18 cxd4, Nd5).

Interestingly, when Sveschnikov himself had Black recently after 10 Qe2, he responded with 10...Nc4 11 a4, a6 (12 bxa6, Rxa6 13 0-0, Ne 714 Na3, Rxa4 15 Nxc4!?, dxc4 16 Rxa4, Bxa4 17 Bxa4, 0-0 with a quick draw, in Kharlov-Sveschnikov, Boblingen 1992).

| $10 \ldots$ | Ne7 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 11 a4 | Ng6 |
| 12 Re1 |  |

We are following Sveschnikov-Popovic, Palma de Mallorca 1989, in which White again demonstrated his rook-lift: 12...Bc5 13 Ra2!, 0-0-0 14 Be3, Bxe3 15 Rxe3, f6 16 Rae2 with good center play. For 12...f6 see Illustrative Game 6, reached by transposition.

## ILLUSTRATIVE GAMES

(6) Sveschnikov-Naumkin, Moscow 1989

| $1 \mathrm{e4}$ | e6 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2 d 4 | d5 |
| 3 e 5 | c5 |
| $4 \mathrm{c3}$ | Nc6 |
| $5 \mathrm{Nf3}$ | Bd7 |
| 6 dxc5 | Bxc5 |
| 7 Bd 3 | Nge7 |

We saw 7...f6 $8 \mathrm{b4}, \operatorname{Be} 7$ (not $8 . . . f x e 59$ bxc5, e4 10 Bxe4! and 11 Ng 5 ) in the Introduction.

| 8 b 4 | Bb6 |
| :--- | :--- |
| $9 \mathrm{b5}$ | $\mathrm{Na5}$ |
| $100-0$ | Rc8 |
| 11 a4 | Ng6 |
| 12 Re1 | f6 |

Notice that White has been in no hurry to play Ba3. While that may interfere with Black's castling, it also gives $\mathbf{f 4}$ over to the $\mathbf{g 6}$-knight and may endanger the $\mathbf{e 5}$-pawn.

| 13 Ra2! | $0-0$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 14 Bxg6!? | hxg6 |
| 15 Qd3 |  |



White reasons that his kingside attack with h2-h4-h5 has been forestalled by 12...f6. Therefore he seeks a new plan based on the f-pawn's advance -and finds it on g6 and e6, which are now hard to defend. Clearly, 15...f5? 16 Ng5! or 15...Be8 16 Rae2 are insufficient.

| 16 Be3! | Rh8 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 17 Rae2 | Nc4 |
| 18 Bd4 | Rh6 |
| 19 h4 | a6! |

Black finds a target of his own. After this White cannot defend both a4 and $\mathbf{b 5}$.

| 20 bxa6 | bxa6 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 21 Nbd2! | Bxd4 |
| 22 cxd4 | Rh8 |
| 23 Nb3 | fxe5 |

This surrenders $\mathbf{g 5}$ but Black was more concerned about the threat to e6 that would follow 24 Nc 5 and 25 exf6.

| 24 dxe5 | Bxa4 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 25 Nbd4 | Bd7 |

26 g3 Qe8
27 Rb1! Rf8
28 Rb7 Kg8
29 Ng5


The extra pawn is Black's only asset from here on. White's plan of h4h5xg6 followed by Qh5-h7ch cannot be met.

| 29 ... | Rd8 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 30 f4 | a5 |
| 31 h5 | a4 |
| 32 Rh2 | a3 |
| 33 hxg6 | Rb8 |
| 34 Rxb8 | Qxb8 |
| 35 Qd1! | Re8 |


| 36 Qh5 | Kf8 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 37 Qh8ch | Ke7 |
| 38 Qxg7ch | Kd8 |
| 39 Ngxe6ch! |  |

Since a double capture on e6 allows a decisive Rh8ch. White finishes matters off neatly.

| $39 \ldots$ | Kc8 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 40 Rh7 | Nb6 |
| 41 Nc5! | a2 |
| 42 Nxd7! | a1(Q)ch |
| 43 Kh2 | Qb2ch |
| 44 Kh3 | Qc7 |
| 45 Nxb6ch | Black Resigns |

In the following Black makes a succession of early, minor errors in the apparent belief that with a closed center he can survive almost anything. He is soon proven wrong.
(7) Vasiukov-Velimirovic, Vrsac 1989

1 e 4
2 c 3
3 d 4
4 e 5
A French from the Sicilian? Yes, in fact this is a common method of reaching the Advance French.

| $4 \ldots$ | Nc6 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 5 Nf 3 | f5 |



This space-gaining device is useful in other French variations, including the Advance line that runs $\mathbf{3} \mathbf{e 5}$, c5 $4 \mathbf{Q g 4}$, f5! when Black has secured the king's wing so he has a free hand for an effective ...cxd4. But here Black has no assurance of making a breakthrough in the center.

$$
6 \mathrm{Be} 2 \quad \mathrm{c} 4 ?
$$

And this is just plain wrong. The closing of the queenside is a fine plan in yet another Advance variation, the one that runs 3 e5, c5 4 c3, Nc6 5 Nf3, Qb6 6 a3, c4!. Then a subsequent bid to break the queenside bind with b2-b3 by White will allow Black to create several queenside holes with ...cxb3. Here, however, White can then respond axb3, retaining pawn control of $c 4$.

| $7 \mathrm{~b} 3!$ | cxb3 |
| :--- | :--- |
| $8 \mathrm{axb3}$ | Be 7 |
| $9 \mathrm{h4}$ | Nh6? |

And this enables White to take the enemy kingside apart with a wrench.

| 10 Bxh6 | gxh6 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 11 Qc1 | Qb6 |
| 12 Qxh6 | Qxb3 |
| 13 Qg7 | Rf8 |
| $140-0$ | Qc2 |

Black seems poised to exploit the absence of White's queen from d1. How does White protect all his queenside pieces as well as c3?
15 Bd1 $\quad$ Qb2
16 Ng5!


Answer: he doesn't have to. Black simply has no soldiers to defend the porous kingside and that sector the board counts more than the queenside (16...Qxal? 17 Bh5ch). Black's rapid collapse there should not be a surprise.

|  | 16 ... | Kd8 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 17 Nxh7 | Re8 |
|  | 18 Bh5 | Bd7 |
| Or 18...Qxa1 19 Bxe8, Kxe8 20 Nf6ch, Kd8 21 h5! and queens. |  |  |
|  | 19 Na 3 | Bxh4 |
|  | 20 Bxe8 | Bxe8 |
|  | 21 Nf8! | Black |

Now the flip side: White plays dxc5 in the following but then overprotects $\mathbf{e 5}$-- without the b2-b4-b5 thrust. And he pays the price.
(8) Kholmov-Naumkin, Moscow Championship 1984

| 1 e 4 | e6 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2 d 4 | d5 |
| $3 \mathrm{e5}$ | $\mathrm{c5}$ |
| $4 \mathrm{c3}$ | Nc6 |
| 5 Nf 3 | Bd7 |
| $6 \mathrm{dxc5}$ | Bxc5 |
| 7 Bd 3 | Nge7 |
| $8 \mathrm{Bf4}$ ?! | Ng6 |
| 9 Bg 3 | f6! |

Well timed. White's delay in pushing his b-pawn has allowed Black to focus two minor pieces on $\mathbf{e} 5$ which means that square now falls to him.

| 10 exf6 | Qxf6 |
| :--- | :--- |
| $11 \mathrm{Nbd2}$ | Nf4 |
| 12 Nb 3 | Bb6 |

Not falling for 12...Nxg7ch 13 Kf1, which costs a piece.

| 13 0-0 | 0-0 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 14 Bh4 | Qh6 |
| 15 Bg5 | Qh5 |
| 16 Bxf4 | Rxf4 |
| 17 Be2 | Raf8 |

(See following diagram)
Black already has a dangerous kingside initiative, which the inevitable ...e6-e5-e4 will only enhance. White has lost the battle of the center and the consequences are:

| 18 Nc1 | Qh6 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 19 b4 | Qf6 |



| 20 Nd3 | Rf5 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 21 Qb3 | Be8 |
| 22 Rac1 | Bh5 |
| 23 Qd1 | e5! |
| 24 Nd2 | Qh4 |
| 25 Nc5 | e4 |

Black gets e5 for his knight now, and White gets d4 in return; this is not an equal exchange.

| 26 g3 | Bxe2 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 27 Qxe2 | Qe7 |
| 28 Ndb3 | Ne5 |
| 29 Nd4 | R5f6 |
| 30 Ndb3 | Bxc5 |
| 31 bxc5 | Nd3 |

And this is why: the $\mathbf{f} \mathbf{2}$ square cannot be held after this and White's collapse follows directly.

| 32 Rb1 | Rxf2 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 33 Rxf2 | Rxf2 |
| 34 Qe3 | Qf7 |
| 35 c6 | bxc6 |
| 36 Nd4 | h6 |
| 37 c4 | Qh5 |
| 38 h4 | Qg4 |
| 39 Rf1 | Rxf1ch |
| 40 Kxf1 | c5 |
| White Resigns |  |

Because 41...d4 and 42...Qf3ch is overwhelming.

| $16 \ldots$ | Kd8 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 17 Nxh7 | Re8 |
| 18 Bh5 | Bd7 |

Or 18...Qxa1 19 Bxe8, Kxe8 20 Nf6ch, Kd8 21 h5! and queens.

| 19 Na 3 | Bxh4 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 20 Bxe8 | Bxe8 |
| 21 Nf8! | Black Resigns |

Now the flip side: White plays dxc5 in the following but then overprotects $\mathbf{e 5}$-- without the b2-b4-b5 thrust. And he pays the price.
(8) Kholmov-Naumkin, Moscow Championship 1984

| 1 e 4 | e6 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 d 4 | d5 |
| 3 e5 | c5 |
| 4 c 3 | Nc6 |
| 5 Nf 3 | Bd7 |
| 6 dxc5 | Bxc5 |
| 7 Bd 3 | Nge7 |
| $8 \mathrm{Bf4}$ ?! | Ng6 |
| 9 Bg 3 | f6! |

Well timed. White's delay in pushing his b-pawn has allowed Black to focus two minor pieces on $\mathbf{e} 5$ which means that square now falls to him.

| 10 exf6 | Qxf6 |
| :--- | :--- |
| $11 \mathrm{Nbd2}$ | Nf4 |
| 12 Nb 3 | Bb6 |

Not falling for 12...Nxg7ch $13 \mathrm{Kf1}$, which costs a piece.

| $13 \mathrm{O-0}$ | 0-0 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 14 Bh 4 | Qh6 |
| 15 Bg 5 | Qh5 |
| 16 Bxf 4 | Rxf4 |
| 17 Be2 | Raf8 |
| (See following diagram) |  |

Black already has a dangerous kingside initiative, which the inevitable ...e6-e5-e4 will only enhance. White has lost the battle of the center and the consequences are:

| 18 Nc 1 | Qh6 |
| :--- | :--- |
| $19 \mathrm{b4}$ | Qf6 |



| 20 Nd3 | Rf5 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 21 Qb3 | Be8 |
| 22 Rac1 | Bh5 |
| 23 Qd1 | e5! |
| 24 Nd2 | Qh4 |
| 25 Nc5 | e4 |

Black gets e5 for his knight now, and White gets $\mathbf{d 4}$ in return; this is not an equal exchange.

| 26 g3 | Bxe2 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 27 Qxe2 | Qe7 |
| 28 Ndb3 | Ne5 |
| 29 Nd4 | R5f6 |
| 30 Ndb3 | Bxc5 |
| 31 bxc5 | Nd3 |

And this is why: the $\mathbf{f} 2$ square cannot be held after this and White's collapse follows directly.

| 32 Rb1 | Rxf2 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 33 Rxf2 | Rxf2 |
| 34 Qe3 | Qf7 |
| 35 c6 | bxc6 |
| 36 Nd4 | h6 |
| 37 c4 | Qh5 |
| 38 h4 | Qg4 |
| 39 Rf1 | Rxf1ch |
| 40 Kxf1 | c5 |
| White Resigns |  |

Because 41...d4 and 42...Qf3ch is overwhelming.

## CHAPTER FOUR: The Modern 5...Nge7

| 1 e 4 | e6 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2 d 4 | d5 |
| 3 e 5 | $\mathrm{c5}$ |
| 4 c 3 | $\mathrm{Nc6}$ |

As noted earlier, the attack on e5 can also be carried out with 5...f6, but this has had a bad reputation since another Nimzovich game (versus Levenfish, Karlsbad 1911) which went 5 Nf3, f6 6 Bb5! and then $6 .$. Bd7 7 0-0, Qb6 8 Bxc6, bxc6 9 exf6, Nxf6 10 Ne5, Bd6 11 dxc5! and 12 Bg5.

Black should delay the attack on $\mathbf{e 5}$ until White has committed his f1bishop to a square other than b5. See also Illustrative Game 9.


5 Nf3
Nge7
This is more accurate than $\mathbf{5}$...Nh6, which appears to needlessly expose Black to the kingside rupture (Bxh6) while offering little in return. The knight at $\mathbf{e} 7$ can go to $\mathbf{g 6}$ or $\mathbf{f 5}$ but if it's developed at h6 it really is headed only to $\mathbf{f 5}$.

After 5...Nh6 White should continue a la Sveschnikov, with 6 dxc5!, Bxc5 7 b4 and if 7...Bb6, then 8 Bxh6, gxh6 9 b5, Ne7 10 Bd3.

In Sveschnikov-Nikolayev, Moscow 1992, White continued in a manner very similar to Sveschnikov's policy in Chapter Three: 10...Ng6 11 0-0, Qc7! 12 Re1, 0-0 13 a4, Bd7 14 Ra2 and on 14...f6 he exploited the kingside in a manner similar to Illustrative Game 6 with 15 Bxg6!, hxg6 16 Qd3, f5 17 Nbd2, Rfe8 18 Rc2 followed by preparation for g2-g4. See Illustrative Game 10.

Note that should Black meet 5 ...Nh6 6 dxc5 with 6...Ng4, White has 7 Qa4! This prevents the capture of the e-pawn and attacks the unprotected knight (7...h5 8 h3, Nh6 9 b4, Bd7 10 Bb5, a5 11 Bxc6 as in KupreychikKaidanov, Lvov 1988).

Also reasonable for White is 6 Bd 3 , as below. Then $6 . . . c x d 47 \mathrm{cxd4}$, Nf5 8 Bxf5 transposes into our main line. And 6...f6 invites 7 Bxh6, gxh6 8 0-0 with good play against a loosened kingside (8...cxd4 $9 \mathrm{cxd4}, \mathrm{Bg} 710 \mathrm{Rel}, 0-$ $011 \mathrm{Nbd2}, \mathrm{Qb6} 12$ exf6, Rxf6 $13 \mathrm{Nb} 3, B d 714 \mathrm{Nc} 5$ followed by Rc1 and $B b 1$ as in Hendriks-Crouch, Dieren 1992).

## 6 Bd3

Another advantage of 5 ...Nge 7 over other knight moves is that 6 dxc5 might be met by 6 ...Ng6 and the e5 pawn cannot be defended by Bf4.

6 ...
cxd4
This results in play very similar to that of subsection (d) of Chapter One, which resulted from 5...Qb6 6 Be2, Nh6 7 Bd3.

On the inaccurate move order of 6 ...Nf5 7 0-0, cxd4 White could play 8 Nxd4! and enjoy the use of the d4 outpost.

7 cxd4 Nf5
8 Bxf5
The only consistent move.
8 ... exf5

9 Nc 3
The exchange of pawns initiated at move six allows the knight to be developed here and then be transferred to $\mathbf{f 4}$ via e2. Also reasonable is $\mathbf{9 0 - 0}$ but White wants to retain the possibility of h2-h4 and Kf1.

A quite different plan is $\mathbf{9 0 - 0}, \mathrm{Be} 710 \mathrm{Nc} 3$, Be6 $11 \mathrm{Na4}$. Then 11...Rc8 12 Bd2, b5 13 Nc5, Nxd4 turns out well for White after 14 Nxd4, Bxc5 15 Nxb5, 0-0 16 Bc3 as in Gusev-Galakhov, U.S.S.R. 1985.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 9 \ldots \\
& \text { (See following diagram) }
\end{aligned}
$$

To avoid White's impending maneuver Black can try 9...Bb4 10 Bd2, Bxc3 11 Bxc3, Be6. Then 12 Qd2, a5 13 a4, h6 14 h4, 0-0 15 0-0, Qe7 16 Rfb1, Rfc8 17 b4 led to nothing in Sveschnikov-Chernin, Sochi 1986. A better plan would seem to be 15 Qf4 followed by Rh3-g3.

## 10 Ne 2 !

Now on 10...Bb4ch White will play another common idea in the Advance French, 11 Kf1!.


In contrast, $10 \mathrm{h4}$, a useful move, can turn out favorably for White after 10...Be7 11 h5, Re8 12 Ne2 as in Kupreychik-Vaganyan, Moscow 1987 -when Black's next three moves were ...Kd7-c7-b8!.

But 10 h 4 allows Black some freedom with 10...Bb4 11 Bd2, Bxc3 12 Bxc3, h6 as in Kholmov-Vasiukov, Moscow Championship 1984 (13 Rcl, Qb6 14 Qd2, Qa6 followed by ...Rc8 and ...Kd7).

It's interesting to note that this game followed another, five years before, between these two players in which White erred with the hackneyed $\mathbf{1 0} 0-\mathbf{0}$ ? and was immediately worse after 10...Be7 11 Qb3, Rb8 $12 \mathrm{Ne2}$, g5! 13 Bd2, f4.

$$
10 \text {... } \quad \text { Be7 }
$$

Now 11 Nf4, Qb6 120 0-0 turned out well in Kupreychik-Pirc, Teeside 1974 (12...a5?! $13 \mathrm{h4}$, g6 14 g 3 , h6 15 Kg 2 , a4 16 Rb 1 , Qa6 17 a3, b5 18 b4!, Rc8 19 Nd 3 and $20 \mathrm{Nc5}$ ). But we prefer:

11 h4


Compared with the Benjamin-Edelman game cited in Chapter One, Black's queen has not moved to b6, but White has not lost a tempo with his f1-bishop in its route to d3.

Best now is 10...h6, protecting a key square and preparing to push the gpawn. Now on 11 Bf4?!, Qb6 12 Qe2, a6 13 Rd1?!, 0-0-0! Black is ready to secure the queenside lines with ...Kb8 and ...Rc8 as in Edelman-Glek, Philadelphia 1990.

The White bishop is somewhat misplaced at $\mathbf{f 4}$ and 12 Nf 4 is better, e.g. 12...Rc8 13 Rh3 followed by Rg3 and h4-h5. See Illustrative Game 12.

Summing up: It used to be thought that in French positions the Bxf5 capture led to sterile middlegames because White had given up his good bishop and was not able to exploit the weaknesses he created in the center. Today, the thinking is more optimistic because of the threats to Black's kingside from Ne2-f4 and the h2-h4 idea. It may not be much, but White seems to have a solid edge.

| ILLUSTRATIVE GAME |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| (9) Bjelajac-Despotovic, Yugoslavia 1977 |  |
| 1 e 4 | e6 |
| 2 d 4 | d5 |
| 3 e5 | c5 |
| 4 c 3 | Nc6 |
| 5 Nf3 | f6?! |
| $6 \mathrm{Bb5}$ | Qb6 |
| 7 Bxc6ch | bxc6 |
| $80-0$ | f5 |



## 9 dxc5!

This is particularly effective now that Black, with his last move, has eliminated the possibility of ...f7-f6. Also the e6 square will be a target now for a d4-knight.

| 9... | Bxc5 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 10 b4 | Bf8 |
| 11 Be3 | Qc7 |
| 12 Nbd2 | h6 |
| 13 Nb3 | Ne7 |
| 14 Bc5! | Ng6 |
| 15 Re1 | Bxc5 |
| 16 Nxc5 | $0-0$ |
| 17 Nd4 |  |



Black had captured with a pawn at move seven in order to bring his bishop out to a6. That idea has failed and his minor pieces are substantially worse than White's.

| $17 \ldots$ | Re8 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 18 Qh5 | Qf7 |
| 19 Qh3! |  |

Avoiding the trick of 19 Nxc6, Nxe5!.

| 19 ... | Bd7 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 20 a4 | Nf8 |
| 21 a5 | Rec8 |
| 22 f4 | Rc7 |
| 23 a6 | Re8 |
| 24 Nb7 |  |

The strength of White's position is demonstrated by the amount of time he can take in selecting a winning plan. Black is fatally passive.

| 24 ... | Rb8 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 25 Qe3 | Bc8 |
| 26 Nc5 | Nh7 |
| 27 Qh3 | N88 |
| 28 Kh1 | Qg6 |
| 29 Qh4 | Qf7? |
| 30 Qd8! | Kh7 |
| 31 Ndxe6! |  |



This requires a bit of calculation but it leads to a forced win by move 36 .

| 31 ... | Nxe6 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 32 Nxe6 | Re7 |
| 33 Nf8ch | Kg8 |
| 34 Nd7ch! | Re8 |
| 35 e6 | Qg6 |
| 36 Qc7 |  |

To save his rook Black must create a winning passed d-pawn.

| 36 $\ldots$ | Bxd7 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 37 exd7 | Red8 |
| 38 Qxa7 | Qf7 |
| 39 Qxb8! | Rxb8 |
| 40 a7 | Ra8 |
| 41 Re8ch! | Black Resigns |

(10) Sveschnikov-Dukhov, Moscow 1992

1 e4 e6

| 2 d4 | d5 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 3 e5 | c5 |
| 4 c3 | Nc6 |
| 5 Nf3 | Nh6 |
| 6 dxc5 | Bxc5 |
| 7 b4 | Bb6 |



Where else for this bishop? Maybe e7. Then 8 Bxh6 and 9 b5 leads to a middlegame in which the Black kingside is relatively safer (...Bg5) but there is little pressure on the center ( Nd 4 ).

| $8 \mathrm{Bxh6}$ | gxh6 |
| :--- | :--- |
| $9 \mathrm{b5}$ | Ne 7 |
| 10 Bd 3 |  |

Note that 10 Qd2, which worked well in a similar position in Game 7, allows Black to become too active after 10...Ng6 11 Qxh6, Qc7 and if 12 Qg7, Qc5.

| $10 \ldots$ | Ng6 |
| :--- | :--- |
| $110-0$ | f6? |
| 12 Bxg6ch | hxg6 |
| 13 Qd3 | Kf7 |
| 14 exf6 |  |

Yet another illustration of the exploitation of the kingside we saw in Game 6. This time White wins absolute control of e5.

| $14 \ldots$ | Qxf6 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 15 Nbd2 | Rd8 |
| 16 | Rae1 |
| 17 | Ne5ch |
| (See following | Kiagram) |


18 Ndf3 $\quad$ Bd7
19 Nd4

Nimzovich would have been proud. The threat is 20 Nxd7.

| $19 \ldots$ | Bxd4 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 20 Qxd4 | axb5 |

Also 20...Bxb5 21 Re3! and if 21...Bxf1 22 Rf3 and wins.
$21 \mathrm{Re} 3 \quad \mathrm{Ra} 4$

22 Qb6 Rf4
23 Qc7!
Black has stopped the Rf3 idea but allowed another win (23...Qe7 24 Nxg6, Kxg6 25 Qxf4).

| $23 \ldots$ | g5 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 24 Nxd7 | Qe7 |
| 25 Nc5 | Black Resigns |

(11) Sveschnikov-Psakhis, Sochi 1987

| $1 \mathrm{e4}$ | e6 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2 d 4 | d5 |
| $3 \mathrm{e5}$ | $\mathrm{c5}$ |
| $4 \mathrm{c3}$ | Nc6 |
| $5 \mathrm{Nf3}$ | Nge7 |
| 6 Bd3 | cxd4 |
| $7 \mathrm{cxd4}$ | Nf5 |
| $8 \mathrm{Bxf5}$ | exf5 |
| 9 Nc 3 | Be6 |
| 10 Ne 2 | Be7 |

11 h4 Qa5ch?!
12 Kfl!


The King is not misplaced here because his h1-rook will enter the game via $h 3$.

| $12 \ldots$ | h6 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 13 Nf4 | Rc8 |
| 14 Kg1! |  |

Now the king avoids all danger along the f1-a6 diagonal. The h1-rook can always be activated along the third rank, or, if necessary, along the first rank after Kh2.

| $14 \ldots$ | Qb6 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 15 h 5 | Nb4?! |
| 16 Bd2! | Nc2? |



Black's play has been entirely consistent -- and wrong. On this or the previous move, castling was preferable.

17 Nxe6! fxe6
18 Rc1
White has eliminated any protection for the c8-rook, so the knight is now pinned at c2 and Black is therefore forced into the ensuing complications. If

Black had avoided this with 18...Qxe6?, then 19 Rc1, Nb4 20 Rxc8ch, Qxc8 21 Bxb4 and 22 Qa4ch would win a piece.

The crucial alternative was 18...Nxa1, after which 19 Nxg7ch and 20 Nxf5 gives White excellent compensation for the exchange.

| $18 \ldots$ | Qxb2 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 19 Ne1 | Qxd4 |
| 20 Rxc2 | $0-0$ |
| 21 Rh3! |  |

This thwarts attempts to make Black's pawns into compensation for the lost piece. Now 21...Qxe5 22 Be3, Qd6 23 Qe2 allows White to coordinate his pieces.

| 21 ... | Rxc2 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 22 Nxc2 | Qa4 |
| 23 Rc3 | Qxa2 |
| 24 Nd4 | Qa6 |

Or 24...Bb4 25 Rc2, Qa4, after which 26 Nxe6, Re8 27 Nxg7! must win. 25 Rg3 Black Resigns
(12) Nun-Zaichik, Polanica-Zdrui 1989
1 e4 c5
2 c 3 e6

3 d4 d5
4 e5 Nc6
5 Nf3 Nh6
6 Bd3 cxd4
7 cxd4 Nf5
8 Bxf5 exf5
9 Nc 3 Be6
$10 \mathrm{Ne} 2 \quad \mathrm{Be} 7$
11 h 4 h6
12 Nf4 Rc8
13 Rh3 Kd7
A surprisingly common king maneuver by Black, almost as common as Kf1-g1 by White. The Black king heads for b8 and because the center is so solidly closed the transfer cannot be immediately exploited by White.

| $14 \mathbf{~ h 5}$ | Kc7 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 15 Rg 3 | Rg8 |


| $16 \mathrm{a3!}$ | Kb8 |
| :--- | :--- |
| $17 \mathrm{b4}$ | Qb6 |
| 18 Rb 1 |  |



The key word in the last sentence was "immediately". White now begins a pawn storm directed at the new occupant of $\mathbf{b 8}$.

| $18 \ldots$ | Na5 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 19 Kf1 | Nc4 |
| 20 Kg1 | Qc7 |
| 21 a4 | Qd7 |
| 22 Nd3 | Qd8 |
| 23 Nc5 | b6 |
| 24 Nxe6 | fxe6 |
| 25 Rg6! |  |

What has White gained from the exchanges on $\mathbf{f 5}$ and e6? Hasn't Black's pawn structure been corrected at the cost of White's good bishop?

No, White has gotten something else in return, including a point of penetration at $\mathbf{g 6}$ and a new target at e6. Another knight is now headed to b4 and c6.

| $25 \ldots$ | Qd7 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 26 Ne1! | Rce8 |
| 27 Nd3 | Bd8 |
| 28 b5 | Rgf8 |
| 29 Nb4 | Ka8 |
| 30 Rb3 | Rf7 |
| 31 Rc3 | Na5 |
| 32 Na6 | Nc4 |

## CHAPTER FOUR: The Modern 5...Nge7

| 33 Qf3 | Qb7 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 34 Rc2 | Bc7 |
| 35 Ba 3 |  |



And this is the "bad" bishop? Consider what Black's bishop does in the remaining moves.

| $35 \ldots$ | Bb8 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 36 Bb4 | Bc7 |
| 37 Qg3 | Bd8 |
| 38 Bd6 | Qd7 |
| 39 Qd3 | Qb7 |
| 40 Rxc4! | dxc4 |
| 41 Qxc4 |  |

White gets two passed pawns for the exchange.

| 41 ... | f4 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 42 Rxe6 | Rxe6 |
| 43 Qxe6 | f3 |
| 44 Qe8 | Rd7 |
| 45 gxf3 | Qc8 |
| 46 Kg2 | Black Resigns |

## CHAPTER FIVE: The Wade Finesse, 4...Qb6

You've been forewarned: The Advance French has numerous transpositional possibilities and, unfortunately, most of them are at the service of Black, rather than White. In this chapter we examine the ...Qb6 move that we saw at the fifth turn in Chapters One and Two. However, it can also be played at the fourth move, with one significant difference.

| 1 e 4 | e 6 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2 d 4 | d 5 |
| 3 e 5 | $\mathrm{c5}$ |
| 4 c 3 | Qb6 |



This has been attributed to the New Zealand (later British) I.M. Robert Wade. The primary objective is to exchange off the bad c8-bishop by way of ...Bd7-b5.

But this strategic maneuver leaves Black vulnerable to a fast-developing bid for the initiative such as the Sveschnikov exchange on $\mathbf{c 5}$.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 5 \mathrm{Nf} 3 \\
& 6 \mathrm{Be} 2
\end{aligned} \quad \mathrm{Bd} 7
$$

Now, of course, 6...Nc6 leads back into Chapter One. In light of what happens next move, one wonders why 6 ...cxd4 7 cxd4, $\mathrm{Bb5}$ is rarely played. It appeared in a few games around 1960 but the authorities concluded that White's ability to develop his b1-knight at $\mathbf{c 3}$ or expand with this queenside pawns was a major concession by Black.

For example, $80-0$, Bxe2 9 Qxe2, Ne7 (not 9...Qa6 because of 10 Nb 5 ). Then 10 Be3, Nec6!? 11 a3!, Nd7 12 b4, Be7 13 Nc3 and 14 Na4, or
10...Nbc6 11 a3, Na5 12 b4, Nc4 13 Nbd2. Black's inability to meet a2-a3 with ...c5-c4 hurts him in such instances.

The other way to use 6...cxd4 is to follow with 7...Bb4ch and gain some time. As usual, this has the drawback of easing White's game by eliminating his pawn-bound bishop and of developing his queenside. See Illustrative Game 13.


## 7 dxc5!

White must strike at this point. With $70-0$ he may be preparing for the exchange: 7...Nc6?! 8 dxc5!, Bxc5 9 b4, Bxe2 10 Qxe2, Be7 11 a4, Rc8 12 a5 as in Nadyrkhanov-Ziyatdinov, Tashkent 1988, or 8 Bxb5, Qxb5 9 a4, Qb6 10 dxc5, Bxc5 11 b4.

But Black can improve with Wade's original intention of 7...Bxe2 8 Qxe2, Qa6!, and then 9 Qd1, Nd7!.

It's interesting that for more than 40 years its been known that 9 ...Nc6 is bad because 10 dxc5!, Bxc5 11 b4 offers White too strong an initiative. So the point behind 9 ...Nd7 was remembered by theory but the basic White plan of dxc5 in other Advance Variation positions was largely forgotten.

$$
7 \text {... Bxc5 }
$$

On 7...Bxe2 8 Qxe2, Bxc5 White transposes into the main line with 9 00.

## $80-0$

Not hurrying the b2-b4 idea. Suetin claims that the best reply to $\mathbf{8} \mathbf{b 4}$ is 8...Bf8!. Perhaps, but after the more accurate $80-0$ Black finds that 8 ...Ne7 $9 \mathrm{b4}$ will preclude that retreat.

$$
8 \text {... Bxe2 }
$$

Here $8 . . . a 5$ counters one White idea but creates another, the occupation of b5. After 9 Bxb5ch, Qxb5 10 Na3! White gets a fine game after 10...Qb6 11 Qa4ch, Nc6 12 Qg4! or 10...Qd7 11 Qe2, Nc7 12 Nb5 and 13 Be3.

White gets an even better idea following 10...Bxa3 11 bxa3, Ne7 12 a4 and Ba3/Rb1. For example, 12...Qc4 13 Rb1, Nbc6 14 Rxb7, 0-0 15 Ba3 was the way Gulko-Vitolins, U.S.S.R. 1979 went, with Black clearly worse on 15...Rfe8 16 Qb3, Ng6 17 Qxc4, dxc4 18 Re1, Rab8 19 Rb5.

$$
9 \text { Qxe2 Qa6 }
$$

This thwarts the full impact of the b2-b4 plan: 9...Nc6 (not 9...Ne7? 10 b4) $\mathbf{1 0} \mathbf{b 4}, \mathrm{Be} 711 \mathrm{Na} 3$ followed by 12 Be 3 , and if $12 . . \mathrm{Qc} 7$, then $13 \mathrm{Nb5}$. 10 Qc2

Nd7
To avoid the potential pawn fork that could follow 10...Nc6 11 a4 and b2-b4-b5.

11 a4!


An important move which initiates a general queenside advance. We are following the instructive 1990 game Kupreychik-Molnar which can be found below.

## ILLUSTRATIVE GAMES

(13) Honfi-Lombard, Bern 1974

| 1 e 4 | e6 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2 d 4 | d 5 |
| $3 \mathrm{e5}$ | $\mathrm{c5}$ |
| 4 c 3 | Qb6 |


| 5 Nf 3 | Bd7 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 6 Be 2 | cxd4 |
| $7 \mathrm{cxd4}$ | Bb4ch? |
| 8 Bd2 | Nc6 |
| 9 Bc 3 ! | Nge7 |
| 10 a3 | Bxc3ch |
| 11 Nxc3 |  |



Clever play by White has solved his queenside problems at no cost (11..Qxb2?? 12 Na 4 ). Generally, White would like to achieve a2-a3 and b2-b4 in the Advance Variation but often he is stopped by Black (...c5-c4!) or he decides against putting his pawns on the same color as his darksquared bishop. Here, neither of those cases is present and White soon obtains an edge.

| $11 \ldots$ | Na5 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 12 b4 | Rc8 |
| 13 Na4! | Bxa4 |
| -14 Qxa4ch | Nac6 |
| $150-0$ | $0-0$ |
| 16 b5 |  |

Now 16...Na5 puts the knight in limbo.

| 16 ... | Qa5 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 17 Qb3 | Nb8 |
| 18 Qb4! |  |
| (See foll | diagram) |

Now the endgame after 18...Qxb4 leaves a7 as a permanent weakling. White obtains a slightly different ending, also favorable.


| 19 Bd 3 | Ng6 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 20 Qd2 | Qc3 |
| 21 Bxg6 | fxg6?! |
| 22 Rfc1! | Qxd2 |
| 23 Nxd2 | g5 |
| $24 \mathrm{Kf1}$ | Kf7 |
| 25 Ke 2 | Ke7 |
| 26 Nb 3 | b6 |
| $27 \mathrm{a4}$ |  |

One winning plan is illustrated by $27 . . . K d 728$ a5, Rxc1 29 Rxc1, Rc8 30 Rxc8 and the knight and pawn ending is very good for White after 31 a6!

| $27 \ldots$ | a5 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 28 bxa6 | Nxa6 |
| 29 Rab1 | Kd7 |
| 30 Rxc8 | Rxc8 |
| 31 Nd2 | Rc6 |
| 32 Rb3 | h6 |


33 Rg3 $\quad$ Nb4
34 h4

Both sides have pawn targets but Black's (at $b 6$ and $g 7$ ) are the weaker. Clearly 34...gxh4 35 Rxg7ch is too much to grant White.

| $34 \ldots$ | Nc2 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 35 Rg4 | Rc3 |
| 36 hxg5 | hxg5 |
| 37 Nf3 | Rc4 |
| 38 Kd3 | Nb4ch |
| 39 Kd2 | Nc6 |
| 40 Rxg5 | Nxd4 |
| 41 Rg7ch | Kc6 |
| 42 Ng5! |  |

The immediate rook ending ( 42 Nxd 4 ?) must be avoided if White wants to preserve winning chances. White now forces the win of the e-pawn, after which he has three passed pawns.

| 42 $\ldots$ | Rxa4 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 43 Re7 | Kc5 |
| 44 Nxe6ch | Nxe6 |
| 45 Rxe6 | Ra2ch |
| 46 Ke3 | d4ch |
| 47 Kf3 | b5 |
| 48 Re8 | Kd5 |
| 49 e6 | Ra7 |
| 50 e7! |  |

Trading the e-pawn for the more dangerous b-pawn.

| $50 \ldots$ | Ke6 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 51 Rb | Kxe7 |
| $52 \mathrm{Rxb5}$ | Kd6 |
| $53 \mathrm{g4}$ | Kc6 |
| 54 Rb8 | Kd5 |
| (See following diagram) |  |

At move 52 and again at move 54 Black could have tried ...Rd7 to push the d-pawn, but White is able to blockade it and win, e.g. 54...Rd7 55 Ke4, d3 56 Rb1, Kc5 57 Ke3, Kc4 58 Rc1ch and 59 Kd2.

| 55 Rd 8 ch | Ke5 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 56 Kg 3 | Ke4 |
| 57 f 4 | d 3 |



| 58 f5 | Rc7 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 59 Re8ch | Kd4 |
| 60 Kf4 | Rc4 |

Nikolai Minev later pointed out that 60...d2 61 Rd8ch, Kc3 62 Rxd2, Kxd2 63 f6, Rc4ch 64 Kf5, Rc5ch 65 Kg6?, Ke3 66 f7, Rc8 67 g5, Kf4! only draws, but 65 Ke6! wins.

| 61 Rd8ch | Kc3ch |
| :--- | :--- |
| 62 Ke3 | Rxg4 |
| 63 Rxd3ch | Kc4 |
| 64 Rd1 | Kc5 |
| 65 f6 | Rg6 |
| 66 Rf1 |  |



Next stop the Lucena position. Black can resign.

| $66 \ldots$ | Rg8 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 67 Kf4 | Kd6 |
| 68 Re1 | Kd7 |
| 69 Kf5 | Re8 |

CHAPTER FIVE: The Wade Finesse, 4...Qb6

| 70 Rxe8 | Kxe8 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 71 Kg6 | Black Resigns |

(14) Kupreychik-Molnar, Rimavska Sobota 1990
1 e4 e6
2 d4 d5
3 e5 c5
4 c3 Qb6
5 Nf3 Bd7
6 Be2 Bb5
7 dxc5 Bxc5
8 0-0 Bxe2
9 Qxe2 Qa6
10 Qc2 Nd7
11 a4 Rc8
12 a5!


A valuable space-gaining move which prepares Qa4 and b2-b4-b5. Black's next move allows him to meet $13 \mathrm{b4}$, with 13...Bxb4.

| $12 \ldots$ | Qc6 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 13 Qe 2 | $\mathrm{a6}$ |
| $14 \mathrm{b4}$ | Ba 7 |
| 15 Na 3 | Ne 7 |
| $16 \mathrm{b5}!$ | axb5 |
| $17 \mathrm{Nxb5}$ | $\mathrm{Bc5}$ |
| $18 \mathrm{a6!}$ |  |
| (See following diagram) |  |

Now 18...bxa6 19 Rxa6, Qxa6? 20 Nc7ch drops the queen.


| $18 \ldots$ | 0-0 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 19 a7 | Ra8 |
| 20 Nfd4 | Qb6 |
| 21 Nb3! | Nc6 |
| 22 Nxc5 | Nxc5 |

23 Ba3!
This establishes a wining pin on $\mathbf{c 5}$.

| 23 ... | Nxa7 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 24 Qe3 | Rfc8 |
| 25 Nd6 | Rc7 |
| 26 Rfb1 | Qc6 |
| 27 Bxc5 | Qxc5 |
| 28 Qxc5 | Rxc5 |
| 29 Rb7 | Rxc3 |
| 30 Kf1 | Black Resigns |

## CHAPTER SIX: The Maneuvering 4...Ne7

This is another finesse, which first gained attention in the hands of Mikhail Botvinnik, and recently has been favored by Yugoslav grandmaster Vlado Kovacevic. It allows Black to make an early choice about the knight, which may be headed for $\mathbf{f 5}$, g 6 -- or most interestingly, to c6.

But there are limits to how much maneuvering Black's position can take, even with a closed center.

| 1 e 4 | e6 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2 d 4 | d 5 |
| 3 e 5 | c 5 |
| 4 c 3 |  |



A rare visitor is $4 \ldots \mathrm{Bd} 75 \mathrm{Nf} 3$, a6 with the idea of $6 \ldots \mathrm{Bb5}$. We'll consider this in a slightly different form in the next chapter. But here it's worth pointing out 6 dxc5, Bxc5 7 Bd3, Ne7 and now 8 a4 or 8 b4 look correct, whereas 8 Bf4?, Ng6 9 Bg3, Bb5! equalizes for Black (NunSpiridonov, Decin 1975 -- 10 Bxb5ch, axb5 11 b4, Bb6 12 0-0, h5 13 h4, $Q d 7$ and ...Ne7-f5).

$$
4 \ldots \quad \text { Ne7 }
$$

This maneuver would seem to make more sense if Black could count on a Sveschnikov strategy of dxc5, which would make e5, rather than d4, the main White weakness in the center. The repositioning of the $\mathbf{g 8} 8$-knight makes the position resemble something out of the Tarrasch French. And, in fact, we can transpose exactly into a gambit variation of the Tarrasch that has yet to be refuted. See next note.

Of course, 5...Nbc6 is another way of reaching Chapter Four. A slightly different move order for Black is 5 ...Nd7 and then 6 Bd3, Qb6 $70-0$, Nc6 8 Nbd2 reaches the gambit position mentioned above. But in Hazai-F. Portisch, Hungarian Championship 1979 White played the superior 8 Bc2!, which risks nothing. See Illustrative Game 15.

Botvinnik preferred 5...Nf5 to 5...Nec6. His game from Hastings 1961-2 with Barden went 6 dxc5, Bxc5 7 Bd3, Nc6 8 0-0, Nh4! -- and what has happened is that White has initiated the Sveschnikov plan under the worst circumstances.

Better is 6 Bd3, cxd4 7 Bxf5, exf5 (Barden-Gligoric, Hastings 1957-8) and now 8 Nxd4!

## 6 Be3!?

There is no unanimity about White's best policy, but this move -- which seeks to make d4 a strong point -- appears to be the most promising method of exploiting Black's attack on $\mathbf{e 5}$.

Other possibilities include:
(a) 6 Bd3, preparing the gambit line mentioned above -- 6...Nc6 7 Nbd2, Qb6 8 0-0!, cxd4 9 cxd4, Nxd4 10 Nxd4, Qxd4 11 Nf3, Qb6 12 Qc2!
(b) 6 Bg5 and 6...Qd7?! 7 dxc5 is a good version of the Sveschnikov strategy -- 7...Bxc5 8 Bd3, Qc7 9 b4, Bb6 10 Bf4, Nd7 11 00!. Then 11...Ndxe5 12 Nxe5, Nxe5 13 Re1 is a problem.

In Sveschnikov-Zeller, Boblingen 1992, Black tried to exploit the pinned e-pawn with 11...f6, but there followed 12 a4, a6 13 b5!, axb5 14 Na3!, fxe5 15 Nxb5 with a very strong attack.
(c) 6 h 4 , Nd7 7 h 5 makes sense as Black's knights play little role on the kingside now and h5-h6 is coming up. After $7 . . . \mathrm{f} 68$ exf6, Nxf6 9 h6, g6 10 Bg 5 the Black weaknesses on the dark squares are not so bad as they seem.

Sveschnikov-Kovacevic, Belgrade (GMA) 1988, went 10...Bd6 11 Be2, 0-0 12 0-0, cxd4 13 Nxd4!?, Bd7 14 Nd2, Nxd4 15 cxd4, Qb6 and Black had counterchances (although he lost).

This is the consistent method of defending $\mathbf{c 5}$.
The problem with $6 . . . b 67$ Bd3, Ba6 is that Black loses a lot of time after 8 Bxa6, Nxa6 9 Qa4!, Nab8 10 0-0, e.g. 10...Qd7 11 Qc2 (anticipating 11...Nxe5!), Be7 12 h4, Qd8 13 Rd1, Nd7 14 h5, 0-0 15 Qe2.

To get his pieces working harmoniously took Black six moves (moves 1015) after which White was ready for the inevitable opening of the center -15...f6 16 exf6, Bxf6 17 h6, g6 18 c4! and White won in 38 moves.

7 Bd3


We are following Kupreychik-Kovacevic, Ljubljana 1989, in which Black forestalled dxc5 and b2-b4 with 7...a5?! 8 Nbd2, cxd4 9 cxd4, a4.

However, White was able to inflict more kingside damage at a faster rate with 10 a3, Be7 11 h4, h6 $12 \mathrm{h5}$, Nb6 13 Nh2 and 14 Qg4. He won in 31 moves.

What had White intended in response to the natural 7...Qb6? Certainly not 8 Qb3 or 8 Qe2, both of which allow 8...c4!. Most likely it was 8 Qd2, with unclear chances, or the speculative 8 Na 3 !? ( $8 \ldots . . c x d 49 \mathrm{cxd4}, Q x b 210$ Nb5, Bb4ch 11 Kfl).

## ILLUSTRATIVE GAMES

(15) Hazai-F. Portisch, Hungarian Championship 1979

| 1 e 4 | e6 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2 d 4 | d 5 |
| 3 e 5 | c 5 |


| 4 Nc3 | Ne7 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 5 Nf3 | Bd7 |
| 6 Bd3 | Qb6 |
| 7 0-0 | Nc6 |
| $\mathbf{8} \mathbf{~ B c 2}$ |  |

This bishop can be preserved now on 8 ...cxd4 9 cxd4, Nb4 by 10 Ba4! and 11 a 3 with advantage to White.

| $8 \ldots$ | $\operatorname{Be} 7$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $9 \operatorname{Re} 1$ | h6 |
| 10 a3! | Bg5?! |

When the attack on d4 fails, as it has here, Black can have severe developmental problems in the Advance French. Black's last move seeks to lure one of d4's defenders (11 Nxg5) as well as a defender of b2 (11 Bxg5).

## 11 dxc5!

Qxc5
12 Nbd2
Even better is $12 \mathrm{Nxg5}$ and 13 Qg4. White now obtains an ideal version of the Sveschnikov strategy with the White e-pawn rock solid and no Black counterplay in sight.

| $12 \ldots$ | Be 7 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 13 Nb 3 | Qb6 |
| 14 Bf 4 | a6 |
| 15 Nfd 4 | Qc7 |
| 16 Qg4 | g5 |
| 17 Qh5! |  |



Black cannot accept the consequences of 18 Nxe6 followed by Ng7ch and e5-e6. He now defends what has become a critical position well.

| 18 Bg 3 | Nc4 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 19 Re 2 | Bd7 |
| 20 Bd 3 | Qb6 |
| 21 Rb 1 | Nxd4 |
| $22 \mathrm{Nxd4}$ | Bc5 |
| 23 Nf3! | $\mathbf{0 - 0 - 0}$ |
| $24 \mathrm{b4}$ | Be7 |
| 25 Qxf7 |  |

White now has a won position, both materially and positionally. But his winning technique places this in doubt.

| $25 \ldots$ | Rde8 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 26 Bxc4 | dxc4 |
| 27 Nd4 | h5 |
| 28 f3 | Bd8 |
| 29 Qg6? | Reg8 |
| 30 Qe4 | Kb8? |

Returning the compliment. White 30...Be8! the bishop is headed for d3 via g6 and the game has to be won all over again.

| 31 Bf 2 | Qc7 |
| :--- | :--- |
| $32 \mathrm{b5}$ | a5 |
| $33 \mathrm{b6!}$ | Qc8 |
| 34 Rd2 | g4 |
| $35 \mathrm{f4}$ |  |



Now Black's queen and light squared bishop are frozen out of the key lines, and Black, as a result, has no counterplay.

| $35 \ldots$ | h4 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 36 Be 3 | Be 8 |


| 37 f5! | exf5 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 38 Qd5 | f4!? |
| 39 Bxf4 | Rf8 |
| 40 e6ch | Rxf4 |
| 41 Qe5ch | Black Resigns |

## CHAPTER SEVEN: Other Defenses

| 1 e 4 | e6 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2 d 4 | d 5 |
| 3 e 5 |  |

The attack on the base of the pawn chain (3...c5) is almost a knee-jerk reaction these days, so much accustomed are we to Aron Nimzovich's principles. But this is not the only option at Black's disposal.


Possibilities include:
(a) Another maneuver, 3...Ne7
(c) The queenside fianchetto 3 ...b6
(d) The attack on the front of the pawn chain 3...f6?!
(e) The Nimzovichian 3...Nc6
(a)

Another Maneuver 3....Ne7
(After 1 e4, e6 2 d4, d5 3 e5)
This may transpose into Chapter Six after $4 \mathbf{N f} 3$, $\mathbf{c 5}$ or Chapter Four if Black cooperates. In the rare instances in which $3 . . . \mathrm{Ne} 7$ has been tried, Black has generally sought to keep the opening on an independent course.
(See following diagram)
4 Nf3
White should not be the first to shift out of our system. As usual, he will meet ...c7-c5 with c2-c3.


4 ...
b6
This order of moves allows Black to seek the exchange of his bad bishop ( $5 . . . B a 6$ ) but without allowing White some more promising system of development such as if he had played 3...b6 (and allowed $4 \mathbf{N h 3}$ for example).

Here 5 c4 or 5 c3 and 6 a4 are among several promising lines for White, e.g. 5 c3, Qd7 (not 5...Ba6? 6 Bxa6, Nxa6 7 Qa4ch) 6 a4, c6 7 a5! or 5 c4, Qd7 6 Nc3, Bb7 7 cxd5, Nxd5 8 Bd3 as in Illustrative Game 17.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 5 \text { Nc3!? } \\
& 6 \text { Nb5 }
\end{aligned}
$$

A different idea involving Nc3 is Bxa6 followed by Ne2 and c2-c3. This is demonstrated by Illustrative Game 16, which began with 5 h 4 .

$$
6 \text {... Nc8!? }
$$

Black can take certain liberties when the center is closed. With this move he covers d6 and therefore prepares to oust the knight ( $6 . . . c 6$ ? 7 Nd 6 ch ).

However, this is a serious loss of time because of $7 \mathrm{Ng5}$, and if $7 . . . \mathrm{c} 6$ then $\mathbf{8}$ Qh5, g6 9 Qh3 with the idea of 9...c6 10 Nxe6!?

Black defended with 9...Qd7 but 10 c4, Bxb5 11 cxb5, Bb4ch 12 Kd1 retained White's edge. After 12...Bf8 13 Bd3, Bg7 Black managed to defend (and eventually won) but that was not the fault of the opening.
(b) The Neo-Wade 3...Bd7
(After 1 e4, e6 2 d4, d5 3 e5)
This is occasionally seen in connection with Black's next move as another means of achieving the positionally desirable ...Bb5.
(See following diagram)


Two can play the "bad" bishop game: with 5 Bg5 Black is forced to choose between 5...Be7 6 Bxe7, Nxe7, which helps White out, or the somewhat confining 5...Ne7 or 5...Qc8?!

The latter is so out of character that it makes 6 c4! a strong idea. Then 6...h6 7 Be3, dxc4 8 Bxc4, Ne7 9 Nc3, Bc6 10 0-0, Qd7 11 Rac1 and, despite Black's control of the $\mathbf{d 5}$ square, he is quite the worst off (BronsteinKyarner, Tallin 1981 saw 11...a5? 12 d5!, exd5 13 Bd3 and White soon had a winning attack).

The text is more direct. Now on 5...Bb5 White has a choice between 6 a4, Bxf1 7 Nxf1 followed by 8 Ng 3 and castling, or 6 Bd3!?, Bxd3 7 cxd3, after which the inevitable ...c5 will allow White to undouble his pawns.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 5 \ldots \\
& 6 \text { dxc5! c5 }
\end{aligned}
$$

This leads to a position in which Black's third and fourth moves have little to do with the demands of the position. White will continue with traditional attacking move -- such as Bd3, Nb3, Bf4 and Re1 after castling. These must assure him of some advantage, since Black has lost quite a bit of time. See Illustrative Game 18.

## (c)

The Queenside Fianchetto 3...b6
(After 1 e4, e6 2 d4, d5 3 e5)
After this move Black declares he will not be putting pressure on d4, since ...Qb6 is now out of the question. Instead, he will let White assume
the role of the pusher of pawns that open the position. Black hopes to exchange bishops after ...Ba6 with no weaknesses.


## 4 Bb5ch!?

This is the latest try and one that would have been looked on with horror in Nimzovich's day since it seems to be inviting an exchange of bishops. (It isn't).

Another promising idea is $4 \mathbf{N f} 3$, and if $4 \ldots \mathrm{Ne} 7$ then 6 c 4 transposing into subsection (a) above. Or 4 Nh3!? with the idea of an early Nf4 and Qg4.

$$
4 \ldots \text { c6 }
$$

The point of White's move is to meet 4 ...Bd7 with 5 Bd3!, after which the ...Ba6 plan has been thwarted. Black then has an extra tempo -- but it's not a useful tempo. In fact, since ...Qb6 is unavailable and ...0-0-0 is now a bit riskier, White has gained quite a bit from the inclusion of the extra enemy move.

Play could then continue 5 ...c5 6 c 3 (Clearly this is one time when 6 $d x c 5$ ? is out of place because of $6 . . . b x c 5!$ ), Nc6 $7 \mathbf{N f 3}$, f6 $8 \mathbf{0 - 0}$, fxe5 9 dxe5, Qc7 and White is just in time to control the center with 10 Re1 and 11 c 4 !.

The game Anand-Rogers, Manila 1990 went 10...Nh6 11 c4, d4 12 Na3, a6 13 Be4, 0-0-0 $14 \mathrm{Nc2}$, Nf7 15 Bf4, Be7 and in the mutual wing attacks (16 b4, g5 17 Bg3, g4 18 Nd2, Ncxe5 19 a4, cxb4 20 a5!) White came out on top.

## 5 Ba4!

This bishop will assume a new life at c2 after c2-c3. Now 5...Ba6 would only inconvenience White temporarily ( 6 Ne 2 ).


Black's queenside is on the march and it is not certain that White has anything to attack yet on the other wing.

However, Lein-Gonzales, St. John 1988 demonstrated White's resources: 8 Nf3, Nc6 9 0-0, c4 10 Re1, h6 11 Nbd2, Nge7 12 Nf1, Bd7 and now 13 Ne3, Nc8 14 b3!, cxb3 15 axb3, Nb6 16 Bd3, b4 17 c4.

## (d)

The Attack on the Front of the Pawn Chain 3...f6?!
(After 1 e4, e6 2 d4, d5 3 e5)
This appears to be premature in the extreme.
4 Bd3


The threat of 5 Qh5ch cannot be dismissed lightly. After 4...g6 5 exf6 or 5 Bf4 both give the White bishops excellent chances.
(e) The Nimzovichian 3...Nc6
(After 1 e4, e6 2 d4, d5 3 e5)
This has nothing to recommend it except that it was played by Aron Nimzovich at the great New York 1927 tournament against Rudolf Spielmann. The position takes on the character of Nimzo's similar defense of 1 e 4, Nc6 $2 \mathrm{d4}, \mathrm{~d} 5$-- except that Black strives to play ...Bf5 before locking the center with ...e7-e6.

4 Nf3
f6
The Nimzo-Spielmann game went 4 ...b6 5 c3, Nce7 6 Bd3, a5 and White maintained his advantage with $\mathbf{7} \mathbf{Q e 2}$ (despite a later turn of events). 5 Bb5!
As Nimzovich himself had demonstrated in an 1911 game, the early attack on $\mathbf{e 5}$ by way of f7-f6 often allows this sharp pinning move.


Threatens 6...Nxe5 (7 Bxd7ch, Nxd7). 6 Qe2!
And White's development is much more harmonious.

| ILLUSTRATIVE GAM <br> (16) Fedorowicz-Prie, Paris <br> 1 <br> 1 e 4 | e6 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 d 4 | d 5 |
| $3 \mathrm{e5}$ | $\mathrm{Ne7}$ |
| $4 \mathrm{Nf3}$ | $\mathrm{b6}$ |
| $5 \mathrm{h4}$ | Qd7 |

This odd-looking move is often played by Black. It anticipates a piecewinning Qa4ch by White (after ...Ba6/Bxa6 and $c 2-c 4$ ). Also, the queen will later find an excellent square at $\mathbf{b 5}$ after a trade of light colored bishops.

| 6 h 5 | h6 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 7 Nc 3 | Ba6 |
| 8 Bxa6 | Nxa6 |
| 9 Ne 2 | c5 |
| 10 c 3 |  |



Here is the underlying problem with these non 3...c5 variations: Black right now would have the easiest method of opening the position for his pieces (...cxd4). But after Nexd4! White would benefit the most from that exchange. And since ...f6 is too risky, Black must allow his opponent to enjoy a spatial superiority for the next several moves.

| 10 ... | Rc8 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1100 | Nc6 |
| 12 Nh 2 ! | Nc7 |
| 13 Ng 4 | Be7 |
| 14 Qb3 | cxd4 |
| 15 cxd4 | Nb4 |
| 16 Qd1 | Qb5 |
| 17 Bd2 | 0-0 |
| 18 a3! | Nc6 |
| 19 Bc 3 |  |
| (See following diagr |  |

With the c-file now safely blocked by White and Black pieces, the kingside becomes the center of attention.


| $19 \ldots$ | Na5 |
| :--- | :--- |
| $20 \mathrm{a4}$ | Qd7 |
| 21 Qd 3 | Ne8 |
| $22 \mathrm{f4}$ | f5 |
| 23 exf6 | Nxf6 |
| $24 \mathrm{Ne5}$ | Qe8 |
| 25 Ng 6 | Rf7 |
| 26 Ng 3 |  |

An irony of Black's bishop trading strategy is that there is now no Black piece that can adequately defend e6, e.g. 27 Rae1 and 28 f5.

| 26 ... | Bd6 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 27 Rae1 | Qa4 |
| 28 Rxe6 | Bf8 |
| 29 Ne5 | Re7 |
| 30 Rxe7 | Bxe7 |
| 31 Qg6 | Qe8 |
| 32 Nf5! |  |

And since 32...Qxg6 33 Nxe7ch is curtains, the game ended with...

32 ...
33 Nxh6ch Kf8
34 Nd7ch! Black Resigns
(17) Kupreychik-Vaganyan, U.S.S.R. 1980

| 1 e 4 | e6 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2 d 4 | $\mathrm{d5}$ |
| 3 e 5 | Ne 7 |
| 4 Nf 3 | b 6 |
| 5 c 4 | Bb 7 |

White's intention was to meet 5...Ba6 with 6 b3!, keeping matters closed. Now 6 Nc3, Qd7 7 Be2 would lead into Sax-Short, London 1980 which turned out well for White when Black failed to enter the complications after 7...Nbc6 $8 \mathbf{0 - 0}$, dxc4 9 Bxc4, of $9 . . .0-0-0$ !. Black has to consider the counterchances against d4 in such lines or he will have no target at all to pressure.

| 6 Nc 3 | Qd7 |
| :--- | :--- |
| $7 \mathrm{cxd5}$ | Nxd5 |
| 8 Bd 3 | c5 |
| $90-0$ | Nxc3 |
| 10 bxc3 | cxd4 |

Black may have been concerned about the surprising 10...Nc6 11 dxc5!, after which White gets more out of the opening of the d-file than Black gets from the weakness of $\mathbf{c 3}$, e.g. 11...Bxc5 12 Qe2, Rd8 13 Bc2. This also explains White's next move.

11 Nxd4!?
12 Rb1 Bc5!
13 Be3 0-0-0
14 Bb5 Bxd4?!
15 Bxd4 Qd5
16 Bxc6 Bxc6
17 f3
Nc6


The resulting bishops-of-opposite color position will favor the player who can open the game for his rooks and bishops. If White can play a2-a4-a5 this will mean him; if Black achieves ...g7-g5-g4 it will be him.

| $17 \ldots$ | h5 |
| :--- | :--- |
| $18 \mathrm{a4}$ | Kb7 |


| 19 Qe2 | Qa5! |
| :--- | :--- |
| 20 Rb4 | Rd5 |
| 21 Rfb1 | Rhd8 |
| 22 h4 | Ka8 |
| 23 Kh2 | Bxa4? |
| 24 Bxb6! | axb6 |
| 25 Rxb6 |  |

White cracks through on the b-file now (25...R7d5 26 Ra6ch; 25...Bb5 26 R6xb5).

| $25 \ldots$ | Ka7 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 26 Rb7ch | Ka8 |
| 27 Qb2 | R8d7 |
| 28 Rxd7? |  |
| Much simpler was 28 | Rb8ch and 29 |
| Ra8ch! |  |
| $28 \ldots$ | Rb5 |
| 29 | Qe2 |
|  | Rxe5 |

Now Black saw that 29...Rxb1 is met by $\mathbf{3 0}$ Qe4ch.
30 Rd8ch Black Resigns
(18) Renet-Mellado, Palma de Mallorca 1989

| 1 e 4 | e6 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2 d 4 | d 5 |
| $3 \mathrm{e5}$ | Bd |
| 4 Nf 3 | $\mathrm{a6}$ |

5 Nbd2 c5
6 dxc5! Bxc5
7 Bd3 $\quad \mathrm{Ne} 7$
8 Nb3 Bb6
9 Bf4 Nbc6
10 0-0 Ng6
11 Bg 3
0-0
12 Bxg6!?
An intriguing decision. White has decided to anticipate 12...f6. Now 12...fxg6! would sharply reduce White's attacking chances.

13 Re1 Ne7
14 Nbd4 Rc8
15 c3 Bc5

| 16 Qd2 | b5 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 17 Bf 4 | a5 |
| $18 \mathrm{Nb} 3!$ | Bb6 |
| 19 Be 3 |  |



Black's decision at moves 15-17 to advance his queenside inspired White to exploit the weakened dark squares, particularly $\mathbf{c 5}$.

| $19 \ldots$ | Rc4 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 20 Rac1 | Nf5 |
| 21 Bxb6 | Qxb6 |
| 22 Nbd4 | b4 |
| 23 Nxf5 | gxf5 |
| 24 Qg5 |  |

Switching back to the kingside, with the plan of Qh5, Ng5 and Qh7ch.

| 24 ... | Rfc8 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 25 Qh5 | Be8 |
| 26 Ng5! | bxc3 |
| 27 bxc3 | Rxc3 |
| 28 Rcd1 |  |

Black has won the queenside but his inability to hold h7 or g7 costs him the game.

| 28 ... | Rc2 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 29 Rf1 | Qb2 |
| 30 Qh7ch | Kf8 |
| 31 Qh8ch | Ke7 |
| 32 Qxg7 | Rc1 |
| 33 Nxf7 | Rd1 |
| 34 Ng5ch | Black Resigns |
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